

Linear-response theory and lattice dynamics: a muffin-tin-orbital approach.

S. Y. Savrasov[†]

*Max-Planck-Institut für Festkörperforschung, Heisenbergstr.1, D-70569
Stuttgart, Germany.*

(February 1, 2008)

A detailed description of a method for calculating static linear-response functions in the problem of lattice dynamics is presented. The method is based on density functional theory and it uses linear muffin-tin orbitals as a basis for representing first-order corrections to the one-electron wave functions. This makes it possible to greatly facilitate the treatment of the materials with localized orbitals. We derive variationally accurate expressions for the dynamical matrix. We also show that large incomplete-basis-set corrections to the first-order changes in the wave functions exist and can be explicitly calculated. Some useful hints on the $\mathbf{k}$ -space integration for metals and the self-consistency problem at long wavelengths are also given. As a test application we calculate bulk phonon dispersions in *Si* and find good agreement between our results and experiments. As another application, we calculate lattice dynamics of the transition-metal carbide *NbC*. The theory reproduces the major anomalies found experimentally in its phonon dispersions. The theory also predicts an anomalous behavior of the lowest transverse acoustic mode along the $(\xi\xi0)$ direction. Most of the calculated frequencies agree within a few percent with those measured.

I. INTRODUCTION.

Response of electrons to a static external field is one of the important characteristics of a solid which can be uniquely determined within density functional theory (DFT)¹. The use of the local density approximation (LDA)^{2,3} in the linear-response problem has by now become a common and well established method for determining various ground-state properties of real materials. These, first of all, include static dielectric, structural, and vibrational properties of semiconductors and insulators such as screening response to point charges and electric fields, effective charges and dielectric constants, as well as whole phonon spectra⁴⁻⁸. *Ab initio* calculations of the wave-vector dependent lattice dynamical properties for metallic systems have also recently been performed⁹⁻¹⁴. Among them, transition metals, their alloys and compounds provide one of the fascinating areas in the study of phonons in crystal lattice. This is because, in addition to the richness and variety of structure of their phonon dispersion curves, these materials also often exhibit lattice instabilities and relatively high-temperature (8K–23K) superconductivity, in which phonons play a fundamental role. Here, density functional based linear-response calculations provide an important first step in studying such phenomena as electron-phonon interactions and transport properties¹² which describe phonon-limited electrical and thermal resistivities, renormalization of specific heat (electron-mass enhancement) as well as superconducting transition temperatures. These properties are connected with the real low-energy excitation spectrum of a metal.

Initially, two methods have been developed to deal with the perturbations which break the periodicity of the original lattice. The first one, known as direct or su-

percell approach¹⁵, considers the perturbation with wave vector $\mathbf{q}$ which is periodical in the new supercell structure. This is possible if the wave vector is commensurate with the reciprocal lattice of the supercell and only tractable computationally if the size of the supercell is not large. This limits the applications to high-symmetry wave vectors. The same technique can be applied to calculate the interplanar force constants in direct space¹⁶. The dynamical matrix is found for any $\mathbf{q}$ using the Fourier transform provided the interatomic interactions of a solid are of short range. Despite of the severe computational-cost restrictions, the supercell approach has two important advantages: (i) the electronic response and lattice dynamics can be studied using programs for self-consistent band-structure calculations which are standardly used in condensed-matter physics, and, as a consequence, (ii), all non-linear-response coefficients are easily obtained. Note, however, that third-order non-linear coefficients can also be accessed within the linear-response approach¹⁷ just like forces are found within the density-functional total-energy method. We shall discuss this statement in more detail later in this paper.

The second method to deal with the perturbations is known as the perturbative approach. If the external perturbation is weak one can use standard perturbation theory and expand the first-order corrections to the one-electron wave functions in the unperturbed Bloch states of the original crystal. Usually it is done by introducing the so-called independent-particle polarizability function in terms of which the screened perturbation is found by inverting the static dielectric matrix of a crystal¹⁸. Previously, due to a rapid progress made in the microscopic theory of the phonon spectra in free-electron-like metals through the development and ap-

plication of the pseudopotential technique, plane-wave representation was used for all the relevant quantities in the calculation. However, already in the case of covalent semiconductors with sufficiently weak pseudopotential, the convergency of the polarizability with respect to a number of plane waves becomes slow and there are only a few attempts to compute phonon spectra within this framework¹⁹. The situation becomes worse for materials with localized orbitals. The most time-consuming step in this approach is connected with the problem of summation over high-energy states which at least requires their calculation. Another problem is connected with the inversion of a large dielectric matrix.

The above mentioned drawbacks of the perturbative approach have been circumvented using the solid-state generalization^{20,21} of the Sternheimer method²². In this reformulated linear-response method, the first-order corrections to the unperturbed wave functions are found by solving the Sternheimer equation (which is the Schrödinger equation to linear order) directly without using the expansions over unperturbed states. This avoids the summation problem of the perturbation theory. The screening of the external perturbation is calculated self-consistently within DFT in close analogy with what is done in standard band-structure calculations. This avoids the inversion problem. The present formulation is thus very efficient computationally which is demonstrated by an increasing number of applications to the problem of lattice dynamics in recent years.⁵⁻¹⁴

In order to solve the Sternheimer equation, one has to construct a rapidly-convergent basis set for representing the first-order perturbations. This is important because these corrections as well as the unperturbed wave functions oscillate in the core region. In the free-electron-like metals, broad-band semiconductors and insulators, this problem can be eliminated by the pseudopotential approximation and the majority of the applications performed so far use plane-wave basis sets^{5,7,14}. Unfortunately, with decreasing bandwidth, the plane-wave expansion of the pseudo wave functions converges more slowly and it becomes less advantageous to employ pseudopotentials. Indeed, until most recently⁹⁻¹⁴, the literature contains no *ab initio* calculations of phonon dispersions for transition-metal systems.

In the present paper we describe an efficient all-electron generalization of the linear-response approach introduced in Refs. 20,21 (A brief report of this work has been published already¹⁰). The first-order corrections are represented in terms of the muffin-tin (MT) basis sets which greatly facilitate the treatment of localized valence wave functions. While the approach developed in the paper is general and can be applied to any kind of localized-orbital representation, we use the linear-muffin-tin-orbital (LMTO) method²³ as a framework of such all-electron formulation.

There are two problems addressed in this paper which are connected with the use of MT basis functions in a linear-response method. The first problem concerns

the construction of a variational solution of the Sternheimer equation. This is necessary because the unperturbed energy bands and wave functions are obtained within the LMTO method by applying the Rayleigh-Ritz variational principle. They are, therefore, not exact solutions of the one-electron Schrödinger equation. As first shown by Pulay²⁴, the use of variational solutions gives rise to the incomplete-basis-set (IBS) corrections in force calculations. The IBS corrections must be carefully accounted for to get accurate forces in the LMTO method²⁵. These corrections also exist and must be taken into account when calculating the first-order changes in the wave functions and the dynamical matrix within the linear-response approach. The other problem is connected with the change in the basis functions due to the perturbation. Since the one-electron wave function in the LMTO method is represented by the expansion coefficients in the MT basis set, under static external perturbation, such as the displacement of a nucleus from its equilibrium position, the change in the wave function will be described by both the change in the expansion coefficients and the change in the basis set. The contribution from the change in the basis set is important because the original basis set is tailored to the one-electron potential and must therefore be reconstructed to account for the specifics of the perturbation. It should be noted that this contribution is not taken into account in the standard perturbation theory, where only the change in the expansion coefficients is taken into account.

The rest of the paper is organized as follows. The variational formulation of the linear-response approach is described in Section II. Implementation of the theory in the framework of the LMTO method is described in Section III. Application of the method to phonon spectra in *Si* and *NbC* is given in Section IV. Section V concludes the paper.

II. THEORY.

a. Density-functional linear response.

Within density functional theory, the problem of calculating the lattice dynamics essentially amounts to finding the change in the electronic charge density induced by the presence of a phonon with wave vector $\mathbf{q}$. Consider a lattice with a few atoms in the unit cell given by the positions $\mathbf{R} + \mathbf{t}$, where $\mathbf{R}$ are the basis vectors and $\mathbf{t}$ are the translation vectors. Suppose that the atoms are displaced from their equilibrium positions by a small amount:

$$\delta \mathbf{t}_R = \delta \mathbf{A}_R \exp(+i\mathbf{q}\mathbf{t}) + \delta \mathbf{A}_R^* \exp(-i\mathbf{q}\mathbf{t}), \quad (1)$$

where $\delta \mathbf{A}_R$ is a complex polarization vector and $\mathbf{q}$ is the phonon wave vector. The presence of such displacement field changes the bare Coulomb potential as follows

$$\tilde{V}_{ext}(\mathbf{r}) = \sum_{R,t} \frac{-Z_R e^2}{|\mathbf{r} - \mathbf{R} - \mathbf{t} - \delta \mathbf{t}_R|}, \quad (2)$$

where Z_R are the nuclei charges. By expanding this expression to first order in the displacements we obtain that the crystal is perturbed by the static external field:

$$\begin{aligned} \delta V_{ext}(\mathbf{r}) = & \sum_R \delta \mathbf{A}_R \sum_t e^{+i\mathbf{q}\mathbf{t}} \nabla \frac{Z_R e^2}{|\mathbf{r} - \mathbf{R} - \mathbf{t}|} + \\ & \sum_R \delta \mathbf{A}_R^* \sum_t e^{-i\mathbf{q}\mathbf{t}} \nabla \frac{Z_R e^2}{|\mathbf{r} - \mathbf{R} - \mathbf{t}|}, \end{aligned} \quad (3)$$

which is represented as a superposition of two travelling waves with wave vectors $+\mathbf{q}$ and $-\mathbf{q}$, i.e.

$$\delta V_{ext}(\mathbf{r}) = \sum_R \delta \mathbf{A}_R \frac{\delta^+ V_{ext}(\mathbf{r})}{\delta \mathbf{R}} + \sum_R \delta \mathbf{A}_R^* \frac{\delta^- V_{ext}(\mathbf{r})}{\delta \mathbf{R}}. \quad (4)$$

To shorten the notations, we will omit $\delta \mathbf{R}$ from this definition and, therefore, $\delta V_{ext} = \sum \delta \mathbf{A} \delta^+ V_{ext} + \sum \delta \mathbf{A}^* \delta^- V_{ext}$. Both components $\delta^+ V_{ext}$ and $\delta^- V_{ext}$ are hermitian: $[\delta^\pm V_{ext}]^* = \delta^\mp V_{ext}$ and translate like Bloch waves in the original crystal: $\delta^\pm V_{ext}(\mathbf{r} + \mathbf{t}) = \exp(\pm i\mathbf{q}\mathbf{t}) \delta^\pm V_{ext}(\mathbf{r})$.

The first-order change in the charge density, $\delta \rho$, induced by the perturbation (3) is represented in the same form as (4), i.e. $\delta \rho = \sum \delta \mathbf{A} \delta^+ \rho + \sum \delta \mathbf{A}^* \delta^- \rho$ and it is expressed in terms of the one-electron wave functions $\psi_{\mathbf{k}j}$ and their first-order corrections $\delta^+ \psi_{\mathbf{k}j}$ and $\delta^- \psi_{\mathbf{k}j}$ as follows

$$\delta^\pm \rho = \sum_{\mathbf{k}j} f_{\mathbf{k}j} (\delta^\pm \psi_{\mathbf{k}j}^* \psi_{\mathbf{k}j} + \psi_{\mathbf{k}j}^* \delta^\pm \psi_{\mathbf{k}j}), \quad (5)$$

where $f_{\mathbf{k}j}$ are the occupation numbers, $\mathbf{k}$ lies in the first Brillouin zone, and j is the band index. The first-order correction $\delta^\pm \psi_{\mathbf{k}j} \equiv |\delta^\pm \mathbf{k}j\rangle = (\delta^\mp \psi_{\mathbf{k}j})^*$ is a Bloch wave with vector $\mathbf{k} \pm \mathbf{q}$ and it is the solution of the Sternheimer equation, which is the Schrödinger equation to linear order:

$$(-\nabla^2 + V_{eff} - \epsilon_{\mathbf{k}j}) |\delta^\pm \mathbf{k}j\rangle + \delta^\pm V_{eff} |\mathbf{k}j\rangle = 0. \quad (6)$$

Here, V_{eff} is the effective DFT potential and $\delta^\pm V_{eff}$ is the change in the potential which is the external perturbation screened by the induced charge density:

$$\delta^\pm V_{eff} = \delta^\pm V_{ext} + e^2 \int \frac{\delta^\pm \rho}{|\mathbf{r} - \mathbf{r}'|} + \frac{dV_{xc}}{d\rho} \delta^\pm \rho, \quad (7)$$

where the exchange–correlation effects are taken into account in the local density approximation. In Eq. (6) we have dropped the term with the first-order corrections to the one-electron energies: $\delta^\pm \epsilon_{\mathbf{k}j} = \langle \mathbf{k}j | \delta^\pm V_{eff} | \mathbf{k}j \rangle$, which are equal to zero if $\mathbf{q} \neq 0$. The Eqs.(5)–(7) must be solved self-consistently, i.e. (i) one has to solve (6) with the external perturbation $\delta^\pm V_{ext}$, or the one screened by

some guessed $\delta^\pm \rho$, (ii) find the induced charge density according to (5) and, (iii), find new $\delta^\pm V_{eff}$ after (7). Steps (i)–(iii) are repeated until input and output $\delta^\pm \rho$ coincide within a required accuracy. This is much analogously to finding the unperturbed quantities $\psi_{\mathbf{k}j}$, ρ and V_{eff} in standard band–structure calculations.

b. Dynamical matrix.

We must now solve two problems in order to calculate the lattice dynamics: to develop a method for solving the Sternheimer equation (6), and to find an expression for the dynamical matrix. The general strategy employed in the following is to consider the dynamical matrix as a functional of the first-order perturbations. Expanding $\delta^\pm \psi_{\mathbf{k}j}$ in terms of the MT-basis functions will lead, under the stationarity condition, to a set of matrix equations which represent a variational solution to Eq. (6).

The variational formulation of the linear-response problem is required because the original states $\psi_{\mathbf{k}j}$ are normally found not as exact but variational solutions of the one-electron Schrödinger equation. In an all-electron method such as the LMTO method, the wave function is expanded in terms of the basis set $|\chi_\alpha^{\mathbf{k}}\rangle$:

$$\psi_{\mathbf{k}j} = \sum_\alpha |\chi_\alpha^{\mathbf{k}}\rangle A_\alpha^{\mathbf{k}j}. \quad (8)$$

The total energy is then considered as a functional of only the expansion coefficients $A_\alpha^{\mathbf{k}j}$, which are found by applying the Rayleigh–Ritz variational principle. This leads to the following matrix eigenvalue problem:

$$\sum_\alpha \langle \chi_\beta^{\mathbf{k}} | -\nabla^2 + V_{eff} - \epsilon_{\mathbf{k}j} | \chi_\alpha^{\mathbf{k}} \rangle A_\alpha^{\mathbf{k}j} = 0, \quad (9)$$

which, in particular, allows all non-spherical terms in the potential to be taken explicitly into account.

In the problem of lattice dynamics the second-order change in the total energy must be found. It is obtained by expanding the total energy with respect to the change in the external potential (nuclei displacements) up to second order, i.e. $E = E_0 + \delta^{(1)}E + \delta^{(2)}E$. The first-order change $\delta^{(1)}E$ vanishes if the lattice is in the equilibrium and the second-order change is expressed via the dynamical matrix of a solid:

$$\delta^{(2)}E = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{R'\mu'R\mu} \Lambda_{R'\mu'R\mu}^{\mu'\mu}(\mathbf{q}) \delta A_{R'\mu'} \delta A_{R\mu}^* + c.c., \quad (10)$$

where we assumed that the nuclear displacements have the form (1) and where $\{\mu\}$ denote directions of the polarization. A formula for dynamical matrix Λ is obtained by varying a density-functional expression for the total energy. It is given by

$$\begin{aligned}
\Lambda_{R'R}^{\mu'\mu}(\mathbf{q}) \equiv \Lambda = & \sum_{\mathbf{k}j} f_{\mathbf{k}j} \langle \delta^+ \delta^- \mathbf{k}j + \delta^- \delta^+ \mathbf{k}j | -\nabla^2 + V_{eff} - \epsilon_{\mathbf{k}j} | \mathbf{k}j \rangle + \\
& \sum_{\mathbf{k}j} f_{\mathbf{k}j} 2 \langle \delta^+ \mathbf{k}j | -\nabla^2 + V_{eff} - \epsilon_{\mathbf{k}j} | \delta^+ \mathbf{k}j \rangle + \\
& \int \delta^+ \rho \delta^- V_{eff} + \int \delta^+ \rho \delta^- V_{ext} + \int \rho \delta^+ \delta^- V_{ext}.
\end{aligned} \tag{11}$$

(We omit indexes $R'\mu'R\mu$ for simplicity.) Here $|\delta^\pm \delta^\mp \mathbf{k}j\rangle$ denote second-order changes of the wave functions, and $\delta^+ \delta^- V_{ext}$ is the second-order change in the bare Coulomb potential due to the displacements of nuclei. The latter is given by

$$\delta^+ \delta^- V_{ext} \equiv \frac{\delta^+ \delta^- V_{ext}}{\delta R_{\mu'} \delta R_{\mu}} = \delta_{R'R} \sum_t \nabla_{\mu'} \nabla_{\mu} \frac{Z_R e^2}{|\mathbf{r} - \mathbf{R} - \mathbf{t}|}. \tag{12}$$

Note that, when expanding Eq. (2), it is only necessary to keep the terms periodical in the original lattice, because only these give rise to a non-zero contribution to the integral with ρ . Consequently, all the contributions with the phase factor $\exp(\pm 2i\mathbf{q}\mathbf{t})$ can be neglected. The same is true for the second-order terms: $|\delta^\pm \delta^\mp \mathbf{k}j\rangle$ are the functions with wave vector $\mathbf{k}$ since they contribute to the matrix elements with $|\mathbf{k}j\rangle$ only. (Therefore, the operator $\delta^\pm$ can be considered as a variation of a Bloch wave, whereby $\pm \mathbf{q}$ gets added to its wave vector.)

The first term in expression (11) is not zero if the unperturbed states are approximate solutions found from the eigenvalue problem (9). If, on the other hand, one neglects it, and performs a variation of Λ with respect to the first-order corrections, the self-consistent linear-response equations (6), (7) will be recovered. The expression (11) is variational with respect to the first-order changes in the wave functions just like the unperturbed total energy is variational with respect to the unperturbed states $|\mathbf{k}j\rangle$. This property of the density functional follows from the Hohenberg-Kohn-Sham variational principle. Eq. (11) is directly interpreted as the electronic contribution to the dynamical matrix. (The part connected with change in the bare Coulomb energy of the nuclei is evaluated trivially by the Ewald technique.) Due to stationarity of this functional the calculation of the dynamical matrix is very accurate: while the first-order changes in the wave functions and the charge densities are only variationally accurate, the error will be of second order with respect to the error in $|\delta^\pm \mathbf{k}j\rangle$. In particular, the convergence of the dynamical matrix during the iterations towards self-consistency is much faster than the convergence of the induced charge density. At its minimum, expression (11) contains no second and third terms and it may therefore be interpreted as the Hellmann-Feynman result (last two terms) plus incomplete-basis-set correction [the first contribu-

tion]. The latter is the analog of the "Pulay force" known from force calculations.

The discussed variational properties of the dynamical matrix are indeed not unique and represent a particular case of the powerful "2n + 1" theorem of perturbation theory: the knowledge of the perturbations in the wave functions up to (n)th order allows one to find the (2n + 1)th correction to the eigenenergy. A generalization to arbitrary order of perturbation within the density functional theory as well as variational properties of even derivatives of the total energy were discussed in Ref. 17. A direct minimization of the dynamical matrix by the conjugate-gradient method has also been demonstrated recently⁷. It worth to point out that the knowledge of the first-order corrections to the wave functions allows us to consider changes in the total-energy up to *third* order, in the same way as the zeroth order unperturbed states allow calculating such first-order derivatives as, for instance, forces. Consequently, third-order unharmonicity constants, Gruneisen parameters and other non-linear coefficients are, in principle, easily accessed within the linear-response formalism.

c. First-order corrections.

We now turn out to the construction of the basis functions which represent the first-order perturbations. Since the unperturbed state is given by expansion (8), the first-order change $|\delta^\pm \mathbf{k}j\rangle$ must include both the change $\delta^\pm A_{\alpha}^{\mathbf{k}j}$ in the expansion coefficients as well as the change $|\delta^\pm \chi_{\alpha}^{\mathbf{k}}\rangle$ in the MT basis set, i.e.

$$|\delta^\pm \mathbf{k}j\rangle = \sum_{\alpha} \{ |\chi_{\alpha}^{\mathbf{k}+\mathbf{q}}\rangle \delta^\pm A_{\alpha}^{\mathbf{k}j} + |\delta^\pm \chi_{\alpha}^{\mathbf{k}}\rangle A_{\alpha}^{\mathbf{k}j} \}. \tag{13}$$

Since $|\delta^\pm \mathbf{k}j\rangle$ is a Bloch state with wave vector $\mathbf{k} \pm \mathbf{q}$ so are $|\chi_{\alpha}^{\mathbf{k}+\mathbf{q}}\rangle$ and $|\delta^\pm \chi_{\alpha}^{\mathbf{k}}\rangle$. The first function is the original linear MT orbital of wave vector $\mathbf{k} \pm \mathbf{q}$ and the second one is the change in the MT orbital due to the movements of atoms. In Section III we will give detailed formulae for the change in the basis functions. Here we note that since the original basis $|\chi_{\alpha}^{\mathbf{k}}\rangle$ is a Bloch sum of atom-centered localized orbitals, the important contribution to the change in the Bloch sum is connected with the *rigid* movement of these orbitals due to the rigid movement of the potentials for displaced atoms. The expansion (13) is rapidly convergent because the basis $|\delta^\pm \chi_{\alpha}^{\mathbf{k}}\rangle$ can be tailored to the perturbation just like the basis $|\chi_{\alpha}^{\mathbf{k}}\rangle$ is tailored to the unperturbed potential. Eq. (13) can be interpreted as an expansion of $|\delta^\pm \mathbf{k}j\rangle$ in terms of $|\chi_{\alpha}^{\mathbf{k}+\mathbf{q}}\rangle$ in the local coordinate system displaced with the atom; the convergence with respect to the number of orbitals per atom must be about the same as for the unperturbed state. This is in contrast with the expression of the standard perturbation theory where, for the expansion of $|\delta^\pm \mathbf{k}j\rangle$, only the change in the coefficients $A_{\alpha}^{\mathbf{k}j}$ is taken into account [first contribution to (13)].

We shall now consider the second-order changes $|\delta^\pm \delta^\mp \mathbf{k}j\rangle$ which appear in expression (11) for the incomplete-basis-set corrections to the dynamical matrix. By performing the variation of the expansion (8) to second order we obtain:

$$|\delta^\pm \delta^\mp \mathbf{k}j\rangle = \sum_{\alpha} \{ |\chi_{\alpha}^{\mathbf{k}}\rangle \delta^\pm \delta^\mp A_{\alpha}^{\mathbf{k}j} + |\delta^\mp \chi_{\alpha}^{\mathbf{k}\pm\mathbf{q}}\rangle \delta^\pm A_{\alpha}^{\mathbf{k}j} + |\delta^\pm \chi_{\alpha}^{\mathbf{k}\mp\mathbf{q}}\rangle \delta^\mp A_{\alpha}^{\mathbf{k}j} + |\delta^\pm \delta^\mp \chi_{\alpha}^{\mathbf{k}}\rangle A_{\alpha}^{\mathbf{k}j} \}, \quad (14)$$

where $\delta^\pm \delta^\mp A_{\alpha}^{\mathbf{k}j}$ and $|\delta^\pm \delta^\mp \chi_{\alpha}^{\mathbf{k}}\rangle$ are the second-order changes in the expansion coefficients and the basis functions respectively. By inserting (14) in the first term of (11) one sees that the second-order changes $\delta^\pm \delta^\mp A_{\alpha}^{\mathbf{k}j}$ do not contribute because they enter as coefficients to the unperturbed basis functions and

$$\sum_{\alpha} \delta^\pm \delta^\mp A_{\alpha}^{\mathbf{k}j} \langle \chi_{\alpha}^{\mathbf{k}} | H - \epsilon_{\mathbf{k}j} | \mathbf{k}j \rangle \equiv 0. \quad (15)$$

(Here, $H = -\nabla^2 + V_{eff}$.)

The absence of the coefficients $\delta^\pm \delta^\mp A_{\alpha}^{\mathbf{k}j}$ in our formulation of the problem has an important consequence: since $|\delta^\pm \delta^\mp \mathbf{k}j\rangle$ has only the unknown contribution from the first-order changes in $A_{\alpha}^{\mathbf{k}j}$ and since the Hilbert space $\{|\chi\rangle, |\delta\chi\rangle\}$ of the basis functions is fixed, we see that the variational freedom of the functional (11) is provided only by the coefficients $\delta^\pm A_{\alpha}^{\mathbf{k}j}$. This is again in close analogy to that in band-structure calculations the variational freedom of the total energy is provided only by the unperturbed coefficients $A_{\alpha}^{\mathbf{k}j}$. In the total-energy calculations this has the consequence when calculating the forces: due to the stationarity condition the force formula does not contain any first-order derivatives in $A_{\alpha}^{\mathbf{k}j}$. In the dynamical-matrix calculation this will have the same consequence when calculating third-order non-linear coefficients: the corresponding formulae will not contain any second- and third-order derivatives of $A_{\alpha}^{\mathbf{k}j}$ and, thus, can be explicitly evaluated from only the knowledge of $\delta^\pm A_{\alpha}^{\mathbf{k}j}$. Note however, that together with the matrix elements containing $|\chi\rangle, |\delta\chi\rangle, |\delta^{(2)}\chi\rangle$, a contribution from third-order changes in the basis sets must be taken into account.

We shall now derive the equations for the first-order changes in the expansion coefficients. This is done by minimization of Λ with respect to $\delta^\pm A_{\alpha}^{\mathbf{k}j}$. We obtain:

$$\sum_{\alpha} \langle \chi_{\beta}^{\mathbf{k}\pm\mathbf{q}} | H - \epsilon_{\mathbf{k}j} | \chi_{\alpha}^{\mathbf{k}\pm\mathbf{q}} \rangle \delta^\pm A_{\alpha}^{\mathbf{k}j} + \sum_{\alpha} \{ \langle \chi_{\beta}^{\mathbf{k}\pm\mathbf{q}} | \delta^\pm V_{eff} | \chi_{\alpha}^{\mathbf{k}} \rangle + \langle \delta^\pm \chi_{\beta}^{\mathbf{k}\mp\mathbf{q}} | H - \epsilon_{\mathbf{k}j} | \chi_{\alpha}^{\mathbf{k}} \rangle + \langle \chi_{\beta}^{\mathbf{k}\pm\mathbf{q}} | H - \epsilon_{\mathbf{k}j} | \delta^\pm \chi_{\alpha}^{\mathbf{k}} \rangle \} A_{\alpha}^{\mathbf{k}j} = 0. \quad (16)$$

This linear system of equations is, in fact, a variation of the original eigenvalue problem (9). It determines the position of the minimum of Λ in the space of the coefficients $\delta^\pm A_{\alpha}^{\mathbf{k}j}$, and non of the second-order changes, such as $|\delta^\pm \delta^\mp \chi_{\alpha}^{\mathbf{k}}\rangle$, affect it. The functions $|\delta^\pm \delta^\mp \chi_{\alpha}^{\mathbf{k}}\rangle$, on the other hand, define the value of Λ itself in its minimum

and must be taken into account in the evaluation of the dynamical matrix.

We must now solve equation (16). This equation involves only the *occupied* states of the unperturbed system, which are necessary for constructing the induced charge density according to (5). It may be solved using an iterative algorithm with the number of operations proportional to $N_{band} \times N_{basis}^2$, where N_{band} is a number of filled bands and N_{basis} is a number of the basis functions used for representing the unperturbed wave functions and their first-order corrections. This scheme is advantageous when using the LAPW or plane-wave pseudopotential methods where the conventional matrix-diagonalization algorithms represent the most time-consuming step which scales as the cube of the size of the basis. The LMTO method, on the other hand, has a small basis and the inversion of the matrix $\langle \chi_{\beta}^{\mathbf{k}\pm\mathbf{q}} | H - \epsilon_{\mathbf{k}j} | \chi_{\alpha}^{\mathbf{k}\pm\mathbf{q}} \rangle$ required for solving Eq. (16), can easily be performed because its eigenvalues are $\epsilon_{\mathbf{k}\pm\mathbf{q}j'} - \epsilon_{\mathbf{k}j}$ and eigenvectors are $A_{\alpha}^{\mathbf{k}\pm\mathbf{q}j'}$, where $j' = 1, N_{basis}$. Because of the minimal size of the basis in the LMTO method, it is not a time-consuming step to find eigenvalues $\epsilon_{\mathbf{k}j}$ and eigenvectors $A_{\alpha}^{\mathbf{k}j}$ for all energy bands ($= N_{basis}$) at some grid of wave vectors $\mathbf{k}$. This is independent of the phonon mode and therefore needs to be done only once. We therefore use the original eigenstates for the matrix inversion. The result for $\delta^\pm A_{\alpha}^{\mathbf{k}j}$ is then substituted into (13) which gives the final expression for $|\delta^\pm \mathbf{k}j\rangle$ in the form:

$$|\delta^\pm \mathbf{k}j\rangle = \sum_{\alpha} |\delta^\pm \chi_{\alpha}^{\mathbf{k}}\rangle A_{\alpha}^{\mathbf{k}j} + \sum_{j'} \frac{|\mathbf{k} \pm \mathbf{q}j'\rangle}{\epsilon_{\mathbf{k}j} - \epsilon_{\mathbf{k}\pm\mathbf{q}j'}} \times \{ \langle \mathbf{k} \pm \mathbf{q}j' | H - \epsilon_{\mathbf{k}j} | \sum_{\alpha} \delta^\pm \chi_{\alpha}^{\mathbf{k}} A_{\alpha}^{\mathbf{k}j} \rangle + \langle \sum_{\alpha} \delta^\pm \chi_{\alpha}^{\mathbf{k}\mp\mathbf{q}} A_{\alpha}^{\mathbf{k}\pm\mathbf{q}j'} | H - \epsilon_{\mathbf{k}j} | \mathbf{k}j \rangle + \langle \mathbf{k} \pm \mathbf{q}j' | \delta^\pm V_{eff} | \mathbf{k}j \rangle \}. \quad (17)$$

This formula has a simple physical meaning. The first three terms containing $|\delta\chi\rangle$ appear because of the use of *variational* solutions. They can be interpreted as incomplete-basis-set corrections to the last term (the one with $\delta^\pm V_{eff}$), which has the form of the standard perturbation theory. If all unperturbed states are exact and they represent *mathematically* a complete basis set, then the first and second terms in (17) cancel, the third term vanishes and the standard perturbative formula is recovered. However, if this is not the case, the use of the functions $|\delta\chi\rangle$ in the basis greatly reduces the number of states $|\mathbf{k} \pm \mathbf{q}j'\rangle$ needed to reach the convergence in (17). Namely, following the above derivation, the summation in the last three terms is over N_{basis} energy states, i.e. over the size of the basis for the unperturbed system. To illustrate the advantage of this formula we consider the so-called acoustic sum rule (ASR): suppose all atoms are displaced in the same direction by a small amount.

The change in charge density induced by the rigid movement ∇V_{eff} of the potential will be equal to $\nabla\rho$. Within standard perturbation theory one obtains:

$$\begin{aligned} |\delta\mathbf{k}j\rangle &= \sum_{j'} |\mathbf{k}j'\rangle \frac{\langle\mathbf{k}j'|\nabla V_{eff}|\mathbf{k}j\rangle}{\epsilon_{\mathbf{k}j} - \epsilon_{\mathbf{k}j'}} = \\ &= \sum_{j'} |\mathbf{k}j'\rangle \langle\mathbf{k}j'|\nabla|\mathbf{k}j\rangle = \nabla|\mathbf{k}j\rangle. \end{aligned} \quad (18)$$

The latter equality can only be obtained if the states $|\mathbf{k}j'\rangle$ represent a *mathematically complete* basis set. This is not case in the LMTO method which employs a minimal basis set to reproduce the energy bands and wave functions within a certain energy window. On the other hand, within the minimal basis set the ASR can be trivially satisfied if one uses the expression (17) for the first-order corrections: here, by construction $|\delta\chi_{\alpha}^{\mathbf{k}}\rangle \equiv \nabla|\chi_{\alpha}^{\mathbf{k}}\rangle$ while the last three contributions vanish. (This is so because they are combined into the integral from a gradient of the periodic function: $\nabla\{\psi_{\mathbf{k}j'}(H - \epsilon_{\mathbf{k}j})\psi_{\mathbf{k}j}\}$, which is, by definition, equal to zero.)

The unoccupied states in the expression (17) should not be considered as real excitation energies and wave functions. Let us consider the induced charge density as a ground-state property of both perturbed and unperturbed systems. In both cases only the occupied states must be well reproduced, the excited states can, in principle, be arbitrary. The LMTO and LAPW methods are very suitable for this purpose: they are fast and accurate within a certain energy window, which is achieved by expanding the basis functions of the original KKR and augmented-plane-wave (APW) methods by Taylor series around some energies ϵ_{ν} at the centers of interest. *The states $|\mathbf{k} \pm \mathbf{q}j'\rangle$ in (17) are the eigenstates of the Hamiltonian matrix $\langle\chi_{\beta}^{\mathbf{k} \pm \mathbf{q}}|H|\chi_{\alpha}^{\mathbf{k} \pm \mathbf{q}}\rangle$ which is itself constructed to reproduce the occupied energy bands well.* This is the energy window of interest and all centers of linearization ϵ_{ν} are in this window. In the KKR and APW methods the states $|\mathbf{k} \pm \mathbf{q}j'\rangle$ have the following meaning: since the KKR (APW) energy bands and eigenvectors are the eigenstates of the LMTO (LAPW) Hamiltonian $\langle\chi_{\beta}^{\mathbf{k}}(\epsilon_{\nu})|H|\chi_{\alpha}^{\mathbf{k}}(\epsilon_{\nu})\rangle$ with $\epsilon_{\nu} \equiv \epsilon_{\mathbf{k}j}$, the states $|\mathbf{k} \pm \mathbf{q}j'\rangle$ in (17) will be the eigenstates of the Hamiltonian $\langle\chi_{\beta}^{\mathbf{k} \pm \mathbf{q}}(\epsilon_{\mathbf{k}j})|H|\chi_{\alpha}^{\mathbf{k} \pm \mathbf{q}}(\epsilon_{\mathbf{k}j})\rangle$ and only those bands $\epsilon_{\mathbf{k} \pm \mathbf{q}j'}$ with energy near $\epsilon_{\mathbf{k}j}$ will be described correctly. In this case, finding $|\delta^{\pm}\mathbf{k}j\rangle$ requires the knowledge of this auxiliary spectrum for every occupied energy $\epsilon_{\mathbf{k}j}$. We thus finally conclude that the excited states are not to be interpreted as the exact ones, *only the knowledge of occupied energy bands is necessary* in our linear-response formulation.

III. IMPLEMENTATION.

In this section, an extension of the linear muffin-tin orbital method for linear-response calculations is de-

scribed. We shall first review the full-potential LMTO method, which is used as the framework in this implementation. Then, the problem of constructing the changes in the MT-orbitals due to the atomic movements is discussed. Other problems considered are the Brillouin-zone integration for metallic systems and the self-consistency at long wavelengths where the Coulomb singularity $4\pi/q^2$ makes the standard mixing schemes computationally inefficient.

a. Full-potential LMTO method.

We first review the LMTO method, which solves the original Schrödinger equation. The space is partitioned into the non overlapping (or slightly overlapping) muffin-tin spheres s_R surrounding every atom and the remaining interstitial region Ω_{int} . Within the spheres, the basis functions are represented in terms of numerical solutions of the radial Schrödinger equation for the spherical part of the potential multiplied by spherical harmonics as well as their energy derivatives taken at some set of energies ϵ_{ν} at the centers of interest. In the interstitial region, where the potential is essentially flat, the basis functions are spherical waves taken as the solutions of Helmholtz's equation: $(-\nabla^2 - \epsilon)f(r, \epsilon) = 0$ with some fixed value of the average kinetic energy $\epsilon = \kappa_{\nu}^2$. In particular, in the standard LMTO method using the atomic-sphere approximation (ASA)²³, the approximation $\kappa_{\nu}^2 = 0$ is chosen. In the extensions of the LMTO method for a potential of arbitrary shape (full potential), a multiple-kappa basis set²⁶ is normally used in order to increase the variational freedom of the basis functions while recent developments of a new LMTO technique²⁷ promise to avoid this problem.

The general strategy for including the full-potential terms in the calculation is the use of the variational principle. A few different techniques have been developed for taking the non-spherical corrections into account in the framework of the LMTO method. They include Fourier transforms of the LMTOs in the interstitial region^{28,29}, one-center spherical-harmonics expansions within atomic cells²⁵, interpolations in terms of the Hankel functions³⁰ as well as direct calculations of the charge density in the tight-binding representation³¹. In two of these schemes^{25,30} the treatment of open structures such as, *e.g.* the diamond structure is complicated and interstitial spheres are usually placed between the atomic spheres. In the dynamical-matrix calculation it is inconvenient to use interstitial spheres because they lead to artificial degrees of freedom for the lattice dynamics. Therefore we will develop the linear-response LMTO technique using the plane-wave Fourier representation. This allows us to apply the method for such materials as *Si* and *NbC* without interstitial spheres. Note, however, that in our previous applications^{10,12,13} for BCC and FCC metals, atomic-cell spherical-harmonic expansions²⁵ were used.

Consider the so-called envelope function, which is a singular Hankel function,

$$K_{\kappa RL}(\mathbf{r}_R - \mathbf{t}) = K_{\kappa Rl}(|\mathbf{r}_R - \mathbf{t}|)i^l Y_{lm}(\mathbf{r}_R - \mathbf{t}), \quad (19)$$

centered at site $\mathbf{R} + \mathbf{t}$ and with an energy $\epsilon = \kappa_\nu^2$. Y_{lm} denotes a complex spherical harmonic with the phase convention after Ref. 32. Inside any other site $\mathbf{R}' + \mathbf{t}'$ the Hankel function can be represented as an expansion in terms of the Bessel functions, $J_{\kappa R'L'}(\mathbf{r}_{R'} - \mathbf{t}')$, i.e

$$K_{\kappa RL}(\mathbf{r}_R - \mathbf{t}) = - \sum_{L'} J_{\kappa R'L'}(\mathbf{r}_{R'} - \mathbf{t}') \gamma_{R'l'} S_{R'L'RL}(\mathbf{t}' - \mathbf{t}, \kappa), \quad (20)$$

where $\gamma_{Rl} = 1/s_R(2l+1)$ and $S_{R'L'RL}(\mathbf{t}, \kappa)$ are the structure constants in real space. Note that, while the index L enumerating the basis functions usually runs only over s, p , and d states, the sum over L' in this expression must include higher angular momenta. Normally l' goes up to 6–8. For convenience, we use the following prefactors in the definitions of the spherical functions:

$$K_{\kappa Rl}(|\mathbf{r}_R|) = - \frac{(\kappa s_R)^{l+1}}{(2l-1)!!} h_l(\kappa |\mathbf{r}_R|), \quad (21)$$

$$J_{\kappa Rl}(|\mathbf{r}_R|) = \frac{(2l+1)!!}{(\kappa s_R)^l} j_l(\kappa |\mathbf{r}_R|), \quad (22)$$

where $h_l = j_l - in_l$, j_l , and n_l are the spherical Hankel, Bessel, and Neumann functions, respectively. The expression for the structure constants is then

$$S_{R'L'RL}(\mathbf{t}, \kappa) = \left(\frac{s_{R'}}{w}\right)^{l'+1} \left(\frac{s_R}{w}\right)^{l+1} \times \sum_{L''} \frac{-4\pi w(2l''-1)!!}{(2l'-1)!!(2l-1)!!} C_{LL'}^{L''}(\kappa w)^{l+l'-l''} \times K_{\kappa w l''}(|\mathbf{t} - \mathbf{R}' + \mathbf{R}|)(-i)^{l''} Y_{L''}^*(\mathbf{t} - \mathbf{R}' + \mathbf{R}), \quad (23)$$

where w is the average Wigner-Seitz radius and the Hankel function $K_{\kappa w l}$ is defined with w instead of s_R in expression (21). The Gaunt coefficients $C_{LL'}^{L''}$ are defined by the integral:

$$C_{LL'}^{L''} = \int Y_L Y_{L''} Y_{L'}^*. \quad (24)$$

We now consider a Bloch sum of the Hankel functions (19), centered at different sites, which, inside the MT-sphere at $\mathbf{R}'$, is represented by the expansions in the Bessel functions:

$$\sum_{\mathbf{t}} e^{i\mathbf{k}\mathbf{t}} K_{\kappa RL}(\mathbf{r}_R - \mathbf{t}) = K_{\kappa RL}(\mathbf{r}_R) \delta_{R'R} - \sum_{L'} J_{\kappa R'L'}(\mathbf{r}_{R'}) \gamma_{R'l'} S_{R'L'RL}^{\mathbf{k}}(\kappa), \quad (25)$$

where $S_{R'L'RL}^{\mathbf{k}}(\kappa)$ denotes the lattice sum of the structure constants (23). The linear MT-orbitals $|\chi_{\kappa RL}^{\mathbf{k}}\rangle$

are now obtained by augmenting the spherical functions $K_{\kappa RL}, J_{\kappa RL}$ in all MT spheres by numerical radial functions $\Phi_{\kappa RL}^K, \Phi_{\kappa RL}^J$:

$$\chi_{\kappa RL}^{\mathbf{k}}(\mathbf{r}_{R'}) = \Phi_{\kappa RL}^K(\mathbf{r}_R) \delta_{R'R} - \sum_{L'} \Phi_{\kappa R'L'}^J(\mathbf{r}_{R'}) \gamma_{R'l'} S_{R'L'RL}^{\mathbf{k}}(\kappa). \quad (26)$$

The functions $\Phi_{\kappa RL}^K, \Phi_{\kappa RL}^J$ are the linear combinations of the solutions $\phi_{RL}(\mathbf{r}_R, \epsilon_{\nu\kappa RL}) \equiv \phi_{\kappa RL}$ to the radial Schrödinger equation as well as their energy derivatives $\dot{\phi}_{RL}(\mathbf{r}_R, \epsilon_{\nu\kappa RL}) \equiv \dot{\phi}_{\kappa RL}$ taken at the energies $\epsilon_{\nu\kappa RL}$. In the interstitial region, the linear MT orbitals are represented as multicenter expansions [left-hand side of Eq. (25)]. In order to calculate the interstitial-potential matrix elements and represent the charge density, we use the Fourier transform of the LMTOs in the interstitial region. It is impossible to consider the Fourier transform of the expression (25) directly because of the singularities in the Hankel functions. On the other hand, since this representation will be used for the description of the basis functions only within Ω_{int} , we can substitute the divergent part of the Hankel function by a smooth function for $r_R < s_R$. This regular function is defined in the Appendix and it is denoted as $\tilde{K}_{\kappa RL}$. We thus introduce a pseudoLMTO $|\tilde{\chi}_{\kappa RL}^{\mathbf{k}}\rangle$ defined in all space as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{\chi}_{\kappa RL}^{\mathbf{k}}(\mathbf{r}) &= \sum_{\mathbf{t}} e^{i\mathbf{k}\mathbf{t}} \tilde{K}_{\kappa L}(\mathbf{r}_R - \mathbf{t}) = \\ &= \sum_{\mathbf{G}} \tilde{\chi}_{\kappa RL}(\mathbf{k} + \mathbf{G}) e^{i(\mathbf{k} + \mathbf{G})\mathbf{r}}, \end{aligned} \quad (27)$$

which is identical with the true sum (25) in the interstitial region.

The charge density and the potential have a dual representation: spherical-harmonic expansions inside the MT-spheres and plane-wave expansions in the interstitial region. This is usually done by introducing a smooth pseudocharge density $\tilde{\rho}$ in all space defined in terms of the pseudoLMTOs (27). The pseudodensity coincides with the true density when $\mathbf{r} \in \Omega_{int}$. In this way, the solution of the Poisson equation is straightforward and can be done along the lines developed in Ref. 33. In practical applications we have also used the technique described in the Appendix for the Fourier transform of the Coulomb interactions and for the construction of auxiliary densities. The exchange-correlation potential is found using the fast Fourier transform and the interstitial-potential matrix elements are explicitly evaluated.

b. Changes in the linear muffin-tin orbitals.

We shall now discuss the linear-response calculation. Small displacements of atoms from their equilibrium positions defined by expression (1) lead to the change in the

Bloch sum of the atom-centered (pseudo) Hankel functions (27). Because of the explicit dependence of the basis functions $|\chi_{\kappa RL}^{\mathbf{k}}\rangle$ on the atomic positions $\mathbf{R}$, here and in the following the displaced atoms will be denoted by the index $\bar{\mathbf{R}}$. The change in the Bloch sum of the MT orbitals can be found analogously to the change in the external potential in Eqs.(2)–(4). As a result, we consider two travelling waves with wave vectors $\mathbf{k} + \mathbf{q}$ and $\mathbf{k} - \mathbf{q}$, i.e.

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\delta^{\pm} \chi_{\kappa RL}^{\mathbf{k}}(\mathbf{r})}{\delta \bar{R}_{\mu}} &= -\delta_{\bar{R}R} \sum_{\mathbf{t}} e^{i(\mathbf{k} \pm \mathbf{q}) \cdot \mathbf{t}} \nabla_{\mu} \tilde{K}_{\kappa RL}(\mathbf{r}_R - \mathbf{t}) = \\ &-\delta_{\bar{R}R} \sum_{\mathbf{G}} i(k \pm q + G)_{\mu} \times \tilde{\chi}_{\kappa RL}(\mathbf{k} \pm \mathbf{q} + \mathbf{G}) e^{i(\mathbf{k} \pm \mathbf{q} + \mathbf{G}) \cdot \mathbf{r}}, \end{aligned} \quad (28)$$

which represent the change of the basis functions in the interstitial region or the change of the pseudoLMTOs in the whole space. Here we have restored the original notations: $\delta^{\pm} \tilde{\chi}_{\kappa RL}^{\mathbf{k}}(\mathbf{r}) / \delta \bar{R}_{\mu} \equiv \delta^{\pm} \chi_{\kappa RL}^{\mathbf{k}}(\mathbf{r})$. We also introduce a spherical coordinate system³²:

$$\bar{\mathbf{R}} = \sum_{\mu} \bar{R}_{\mu} e^{\mu} = \bar{R}_{-1} e^{-1} + \bar{R}_0 e^0 + \bar{R}_{+1} e^{+1}, \quad (29)$$

which is connected to the Cartesian system as follows: $\bar{R}_{-1} = +(\bar{R}_x - i\bar{R}_y)/\sqrt{2}$, $\bar{R}_0 = \bar{R}_z$, $\bar{R}_{+1} = -(\bar{R}_x + i\bar{R}_y)/\sqrt{2}$. The reason is that, in the spherical coordinates, the operation ∇_{μ} on a product of a radial function $f(r)$ multiplied by the spherical harmonic takes the simple form:

$$\begin{aligned} \nabla_{\mu} f(r) Y_{lm}(\mathbf{r}) &= \\ \sqrt{\frac{4\pi}{3}} C_{lm+1+\mu}^{1\mu} \left(\frac{df}{dr} - \frac{l}{r} f(r) \right) Y_{l+1m+\mu}(\mathbf{r}) + \\ \sqrt{\frac{4\pi}{3}} C_{lm-1+\mu}^{1\mu} \left(\frac{df}{dr} + \frac{l+1}{r} f(r) \right) Y_{l-1m+\mu}(\mathbf{r}). \end{aligned} \quad (30)$$

We shall now find variation of the basis functions inside the MT spheres. In the sphere $\mathbf{R}'$, the original LMTO is defined in the expression (26). Its change must include both the changes in the numerical radial functions and the change in the structure constants:

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\delta^{\pm} \chi_{\kappa RL}^{\mathbf{k}}(\mathbf{r}_{R'})}{\delta \bar{R}_{\mu}} &= \frac{\delta^{\pm} \Phi_{\kappa RL}^K(\mathbf{r}_R)}{\delta \bar{R}_{\mu}} \delta_{R'R} - \\ &\sum_{L'} \frac{\delta^{\pm} \Phi_{\kappa R'L'}^J(\mathbf{r}_{R'})}{\delta \bar{R}_{\mu}} \gamma_{R'L'} S_{R'L'RL}^{\mathbf{k}}(\kappa) - \\ &\sum_{L'} \Phi_{\kappa R'L'}^J(\mathbf{r}_{R'}) \gamma_{R'L'} \frac{\delta^{\pm} S_{R'L'RL}^{\mathbf{k}}(\kappa)}{\delta \bar{R}_{\mu}}. \end{aligned} \quad (31)$$

The change in the numerical functions contains two contributions. Since $\Phi_{\kappa RL}^K$, $\Phi_{\kappa RL}^J$ are constructed from the solutions of the radial Schrödinger equation and their energy derivatives, $\phi_{\kappa RL}$ and $\dot{\phi}_{\kappa RL}$, the change in $\phi_{\kappa RL}$ and

$\dot{\phi}_{\kappa RL}$ is a result of both the rigid movement of the spherical component of the potential and the change in the shape of the spherical component. In the following, it is convenient to treat the rigid movements of the potential within the MT-sphere centered at $\mathbf{R}$ separately, i.e. represent the total change in the form:

$$\frac{\delta^{\pm} V_{eff}(\mathbf{r}_R)}{\delta \bar{R}_{\mu}} = -\delta_{\bar{R}R} \nabla_{\mu} V_{eff}(\mathbf{r}_R) + \frac{\delta_{(s)}^{\pm} V_{eff}(\mathbf{r}_R)}{\delta \bar{R}_{\mu}}, \quad (32)$$

where the notation $\delta_{(s)}^{\pm}$ stands for the "soft" change, i.e. the variation connected with the change in the shape of the function. The functions $\delta^{\pm} \phi_{\kappa RL} / \delta \bar{R}_{\mu}$ are represented in a form similar to (32), i.e. $\delta^{\pm} \phi_{\kappa RL} / \delta \bar{R}_{\mu} = -\delta_{\bar{R}R} \nabla_{\mu} \phi_{\kappa RL} + \delta_{(s)}^{\pm} \phi_{\kappa RL} / \delta \bar{R}_{\mu}$, where the last (soft) contribution is found by solving the radial Sternheimer equation:

$$\begin{aligned} \left(-\nabla_r^2 + \frac{l(l+1)}{r^2} + V_{eff}^{SPH} - \epsilon_{\nu \kappa RL} \right) \frac{\delta_{(s)}^{\pm} \phi_{\kappa RL}}{\delta \bar{R}_{\mu}} + \\ \left(\frac{\delta_{(s)}^{\pm} V_{eff}^{SPH}}{\delta \bar{R}_{\mu}} - \frac{\delta_{(s)}^{\pm} \epsilon_{\nu \kappa RL}}{\delta \bar{R}_{\mu}} \right) \phi_{\kappa RL} = 0. \end{aligned} \quad (33)$$

The superscript "SPH" here denotes the spherical component of the potential and the perturbation. It is, in principle, not a problem to take all non-spherical terms of the perturbation into account. If this is done, the first-order changes in the radial functions are no longer given by a single spherical harmonic but as an expansion in Y_{lm} . One obtains an *uncoupled* system of radial equations, which can easily be solved⁹. However, in the problem of lattice dynamics the change in $\phi_{\kappa RL}$ and $\dot{\phi}_{\kappa RL}$ due to the change in the shape of the spherical component of the potential is small. This is because the motions of atoms mainly distort the dipole part of the potential. If the change in the shape of the spherical component can be described by some constant shift of the energy, it may be cancelled by appropriate choice of the change $\delta_{(s)}^{\pm} \epsilon_{\nu \kappa RL} / \delta \bar{R}_{\mu}$ in the energies $\epsilon_{\nu \kappa RL}$. This cancellation can, for instance, be obtained by finding $\delta_{(s)}^{\pm} \epsilon_{\nu \kappa RL} / \delta \bar{R}_{\mu}$ with fixed logarithmic derivatives $D_{\nu \kappa RL}$. (The derivatives $D_{\nu \kappa RL}$ are evaluated at the occupied centers of gravities of the bands for the unperturbed crystal.) We thus see that the influence of the constant shifts to the change in the basis set can be eliminated and, therefore, one can neglect by the contribution $\delta_{(s)}^{\pm} \phi_{\kappa RL} / \delta \bar{R}_{\mu}$ in practical calculations. The accuracy of this approximation is quite good which has already been confirmed by good agreement between total energy and force calculations with the original LMTO method²⁵ where the same approximation was used for deriving the force formula.

We now give the formula for the change in the structure constants which enters Eq. (31). It is expressed as the difference between the gradients of the structure constants for wave vectors $\mathbf{k}$ and $\mathbf{k} \pm \mathbf{q}$, i.e

$$\frac{\delta^\pm S_{R'L'RL}^{\mathbf{k}}(\kappa)}{\delta \bar{R}_\mu} = \delta_{\bar{R}R'} \nabla_\mu S_{R'L'RL}^{\mathbf{k}}(\kappa) - \delta_{\bar{R}R} \nabla_\mu S_{R'L'RL}^{\mathbf{k} \pm \mathbf{q}}(\kappa). \quad (34)$$

The gradient is with respect to $\mathbf{R}' - \mathbf{R}$. From (30), using the recursion relations for the Hankel functions, it follows that the change in the structure constants can be expressed in terms of the structure constants:

$$\begin{aligned} \nabla_\mu S_{R'L'm'RLm}^{\mathbf{k}}(\kappa) = & i\sqrt{\frac{4\pi}{3}} C_{l'-1m'-\mu l'm'}^{1\mu} \frac{\kappa^2 s_{R'}}{(2l'-1)} S_{R'l'-1m'-\mu Rlm}^{\mathbf{k}}(\kappa) + \\ & + i\sqrt{\frac{4\pi}{3}} C_{l'+1m'-\mu l'm'}^{1\mu} \frac{(2l'+1)}{s_{R'}} S_{R'l'+1m'-\mu Rlm}^{\mathbf{k}}(\kappa). \end{aligned} \quad (35)$$

Here, the left index of the structure constants has changed to $l' \pm 1, m' - \mu$, but the right index lm remains the same. An analogous formula exist in which the right index change is $l \pm 1, m + \mu$ in and the left index is unchanged.

It is seen that the change in the MT orbital (31) can be represented as a rigid part, a small soft part and a contribution from the change in the structure constants:

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\delta^\pm \chi_{\kappa RL}^{\mathbf{k}}(\mathbf{r}_{R'})}{\delta \bar{R}_\mu} = & -\delta_{\bar{R}R'} \nabla_\mu \chi_{\kappa RL}^{\mathbf{k}}(\mathbf{r}_{R'}) + \frac{\delta_{(s)}^\pm \chi_{\kappa RL}^{\mathbf{k}}(\mathbf{r}_{R'})}{\delta \bar{R}_\mu} - \\ & \sum_{L'} \Phi_{\kappa R'L'}^J(\mathbf{r}_{R'}) \gamma_{R'L'} \frac{\delta^\pm S_{R'L'RL}^{\mathbf{k}}(\kappa)}{\delta \bar{R}_\mu}. \end{aligned} \quad (36)$$

It is convenient to separate the rigid part since it gives rise to a rigid contribution in the electronic response:

$$\frac{\delta^\pm \rho(\mathbf{r}_R)}{\delta \bar{R}_\mu} = -\delta_{\bar{R}R} \nabla_\mu \rho(\mathbf{r}_R) + \frac{\delta_{(s)}^\pm \rho(\mathbf{r}_R)}{\delta \bar{R}_\mu}. \quad (37)$$

Since the induced charge density (37) has the same form as the change in the potential (32), we need not calculate the gradients of the charge density and the potential. This is important since these gradients are huge in the core region, which could result in large numerical errors. The second term in (36) is $\delta_{(s)}^\pm \chi_{\kappa RL}^{\mathbf{k}}(\mathbf{r}_{R'})/\delta \bar{R}_\mu$. It is constructed from the changes $\delta_{(s)}^\pm \phi_{\kappa RL}/\delta \bar{R}_\mu$ and their energy derivatives which are numerically small. This function is exactly equal to zero together with its first-order radial derivative at the sphere $s_{R'}$. It translates like a Bloch wave with vector $\mathbf{k} \pm \mathbf{q}$ because the original form of one-center expansion (26) translates with wave vector $\mathbf{k}$ while the first-order changes $\delta_{(s)}^\pm \phi_{\kappa RL}/\delta \bar{R}_\mu$ translate, like the perturbation, with wave vector $\pm \mathbf{q}$. The whole expression (36) also translates with wave vector $\mathbf{k} \pm \mathbf{q}$ and fits into the multicenter expansion of the change in the basis set in the interstitial region [formula (28)]. However, since the original LMTOs are continuous and only differentiable to first order at the boundaries of the MT spheres, the matching of the change in the basis set is

only continuous but not differentiable. This, in principle, leads to a kink in the change of the charge density. However, it does not have any effect in the calculation of the dynamical matrix if the latter is compared with the second-order derivative of the total energy derived from the frozen-phonon supercell calculation. This is so because the extension of the LMTO method described here is just an analytical version of the finite-difference approach employed in the supercell technique. When applied to the same problem, the results of both approaches have to be the same except for the errors introduced by taking finite differences. This concerns the comparison of not only the dynamical matrix and the phonon frequencies, but also the changes in the basis set, the expansion coefficients, the charge densities and in all other quantities which can be obtained by the frozen-phonon LMTO technique.

We now turn to the problem of calculating the change in the expansion coefficients $A_{\kappa RL}^{\mathbf{k}j}$, which are necessary to compute the first-order corrections according to (13). From expression (17), the change $\delta^\pm A_{\kappa RL}^{\mathbf{k}j}/\delta \bar{R}_\mu$ is given by

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\delta^\pm A_{\kappa RL}^{\mathbf{k}j}}{\delta \bar{R}_\mu} = & \sum_{j'} \frac{A_{\kappa RL}^{\mathbf{k} \pm \mathbf{q} j'}}{\epsilon_{\mathbf{k}j} - \epsilon_{\mathbf{k} \pm \mathbf{q} j'}} \\ & \times \left(\frac{\delta^\pm H^{\mathbf{k} \pm \mathbf{q} j' \mathbf{k} j}}{\delta \bar{R}_\mu} - \epsilon_{\mathbf{k}j} \frac{\delta^\pm O^{\mathbf{k} \pm \mathbf{q} j' \mathbf{k} j}}{\delta \bar{R}_\mu} \right) \end{aligned} \quad (38)$$

and it is expressed in terms of the change in the hamiltonian and the overlap matrices. Here, the change in the matrix elements of the hamiltonian is given by the band representation:

$$\frac{\delta^\pm H^{\mathbf{k} \pm \mathbf{q} j' \mathbf{k} j}}{\delta \bar{R}_\mu} = \sum_{\kappa' R' L'} \sum_{\kappa RL} A_{\kappa' R' L'}^{\mathbf{k} \pm \mathbf{q} j'} \frac{\delta^\pm H_{\kappa' R' L' \kappa RL}}{\delta \bar{R}_\mu} A_{\kappa RL}^{\mathbf{k} j} \quad (39)$$

and a similar formula holds for the matrix elements of the overlap integral. In the original, $\{\kappa RL\}$, representation the changes $\delta^\pm H_{\kappa' R' L' \kappa RL}/\delta \bar{R}_\mu$ and $\delta^\pm O_{\kappa' R' L' \kappa RL}/\delta \bar{R}_\mu$ are readily computed using the formulae (28) and (36) for the first-order changes in the basis set. It is indeed even more advantageous to find the corresponding formulae by directly varying the expressions for the hamiltonian and the overlap matrices. This avoids the problem of combining the contributions with the gradients of numerical radial functions to the surface integrals. One point about calculating the change in the interstitial kinetic-energy matrix elements and the interstitial overlap integrals is worth noticing. Since these matrix elements contain energy-derivative of the structure constants, the change in these matrix elements will contain the change in this energy derivative. The corresponding formula can be found by taking the derivative with respect to κ^2 in the expressions (34) and (35).

Another problem is to find second-order changes in the LMTO basis functions as well as second-order variations

in the Hamiltonian and the overlap matrices. They are necessary for computing the incomplete-basis-set corrections in (11) for the dynamical matrix. In the interstitial region the second-order change in the pseudoLMTOs is simply given by:

$$\frac{\delta^+ \delta^- \chi_{\kappa RL}^{\mathbf{k}}(\mathbf{r})}{\delta \bar{R}'_{\mu'} \delta \bar{R}_{\mu}} = \delta_{\bar{R}'R} \delta_{\bar{R}R} \sum_G i(k+G)_{\mu'} i(k+G)_{\mu} \times \chi_{\kappa RL}(\mathbf{k} + \mathbf{G}) e^{i(\mathbf{k} + \mathbf{G})\mathbf{r}}. \quad (40)$$

Inside the MT spheres the expression is more complicated, but can be found straightforwardly by performing one more variation $\delta^-/\delta \bar{R}_{\mu'}$ of expression (31) for the first-order change. It will contain second-order changes in the numerical radial functions and second-order changes in the structure constants as well as different products of the first-order changes in these quantities. The second-order changes in the structure constants are given by

$$\frac{\delta^+ \delta^- S_{R'L'RL}^{\mathbf{k}}(\kappa)}{\delta \bar{R}'_{\mu'} \delta \bar{R}_{\mu}} = \delta_{\bar{R}R'} \nabla_{\mu} \frac{\delta^- S_{R'L'RL}^{\mathbf{k}}(\kappa)}{\delta \bar{R}'_{\mu'}} - \delta_{\bar{R}R} \nabla_{\mu} \frac{\delta^- S_{R'L'RL}^{\mathbf{k}+\mathbf{q}}(\kappa)}{\delta \bar{R}'_{\mu'}}. \quad (41)$$

This is obtained from the expression (34) and $\delta^- S^{\mathbf{k}}$ is expressed via the difference between the gradients of the structure constants for the wave vectors $\mathbf{k}$ and $\mathbf{k} - \mathbf{q}$, while $\delta^- S^{\mathbf{k}+\mathbf{q}}$ is the difference between ∇S for the wave vectors $\mathbf{k} + \mathbf{q}$ and $\mathbf{k}$. Alternatively, the expression (41) can be found by first considering the expression for the structure constants in the supercell and then, assuming the form (1) for the atomic displacements, transferring the supercell expression to the original structure. The second-order gradients $\nabla_{\mu'} \nabla_{\mu} S$ are calculated using (35) and they are again the structure constants with the left index changed to $l' \pm 2, m' - \mu' - \mu$ and unchanged right index. Analogously, they can be expressed in terms of the structure constants of the same left index $l'm'$ and the right index: $l \pm 2, m + \mu' + \mu$.

The second-order changes in the numerical radial functions must also be calculated. They contain contributions $\nabla_{\mu'} \nabla_{\mu} \Phi_{\kappa RL}^{K,J}$ due to the rigid movement of the spherical part of the potential to second order, changes due to the rigid movements of the first-order variations in the shape of the spherical part (rigid movement of the soft part), as well as the contributions arising from the change in the shape of the spherical part to second order (second-order soft part). As we discussed above, one can neglect by the influence of the change in the shape of V_{eff}^{SPH} to the change in the basis. Therefore, we must only keep the rigid contributions described by $\nabla_{\mu'} \nabla_{\mu} \Phi_{\kappa RL}^{K,J}$.

c. Brillouin-zone integrals.

After computing the first-order corrections to the wave functions, we have to perform the $\mathbf{k}$ -space integration over the first Brillouin zone (BZ) in order to find the change in the charge density from Eq. (6). The BZ integration is also required for calculating the incomplete-basis-set corrections to the dynamical matrix. It is in general a full-zone integration while for the high-symmetry wave vectors the integrals are reduced to that portion of the BZ which is irreducible with respect to the symmetry of the perturbation vector.

Two kinds of the integrals have to be performed in the linear-response calculation. The first one has the following form

$$I_1(\mathbf{q}) = \sum_{\mathbf{k}j} 2f_{\mathbf{k}j} A_{\mathbf{k}j}(\mathbf{q}) \quad (42)$$

and the second one is given by

$$I_2(\mathbf{q}) = \sum_{\mathbf{k}j j'} \frac{2f_{\mathbf{k}j}(1 - f_{\mathbf{k} \pm \mathbf{q} j'})}{\epsilon_{\mathbf{k}j} - \epsilon_{\mathbf{k} \pm \mathbf{q} j'}} M^{\mathbf{k} \pm \mathbf{q} j' \mathbf{k} j}. \quad (43)$$

where $A_{\mathbf{k}j}(\mathbf{q})$ and $M^{\mathbf{k} \pm \mathbf{q} j' \mathbf{k} j}$ are the matrix elements which presumably are smooth functions of wave vectors. In order to calculate these integrals we use the tetrahedron method in Ref. 34. In this method, the BZ is set up by the reciprocal-lattice translational vectors and it is divided into small primitive cells exactly as in standard fast-Fourier-transform analysis. The calculation becomes simpler if the $\mathbf{q}$ vector coincides with a mesh point because $\mathbf{k} \pm \mathbf{q}$ vectors are also mesh points. In this way the energy bands, the expansion coefficients, and the structure constants have to be calculated only once at the mesh of the irreducible wave vectors $\mathbf{k}$ for the unperturbed crystal. Applying symmetry operations, these quantities can be found for any general $\mathbf{k}$.

When applied to a semiconductor, the tetrahedron method is identical to the special-point method of Monkhorst and Pack³⁶, which means that the occupation numbers $f_{\mathbf{k}j}$ in (42) and (43) can be regarded as the geometrical weights of the $\mathbf{k}$ -points. Both integrals (42) and (43) converge rapidly with respect to the number of $\mathbf{k}$ -points. The integral $I_2(\mathbf{q})$ reduces to the integral $I_1(\mathbf{q})$ by performing the summation over the unoccupied bands j' .

For metallic systems a significantly larger number of $\mathbf{k}$ -points (N_k) is necessary when the matrix elements as well as the energy denominator $\epsilon_{\mathbf{k}j} - \epsilon_{\mathbf{k} \pm \mathbf{q} j'}$ are interpolated linearly within the tetrahedron. For these systems there are two sources of errors: the first is connected with the interpolation of the matrix elements and the second is connected with the interpolation of the Fermi surface. The latter can easily be circumvented in the linear-response calculation, since the Fermi surface can be determined accurately from the band structure of the unperturbed crystal. For the integrals $I_1(\mathbf{q})$ this can be done using the method described in Ref. 35 which is based on considering two, coarse and dense, meshes. In the

tetrahedron method the integration weight of a particular $\mathbf{k}$ -point is calculated by integrating over the occupied parts of those tetrahedra that contain this point. The occupied part of the tetrahedron is found by linear interpolation between the energies at the corners of this tetrahedron. Suppose we introduce a much denser mesh that also contains the original coarse mesh. We will need only the energies $\epsilon_{\mathbf{k}j}$ at this dense mesh, which will define the accurate Fermi surface (for example also by linear interpolation). Then, the occupied part of the tetrahedron at the coarse grid can be found by not interpolating linearly the energies known at its corners but as a piece of the accurate Fermi surface found with help of the dense grid. The same is applicable to the integrals $I_2(\mathbf{q})$: we consider the dense and the coarse grids. The band energies are known at the dense grid. To find the integration weights we must find a region in the tetrahedron where the state $|\mathbf{k}j\rangle$ is occupied and the state $|\mathbf{k} \pm \mathbf{q}j\rangle$ is unoccupied. This can be done using the linear interpolation but on the dense grid. We must also include the energy denominator $\epsilon_{\mathbf{k}j} - \epsilon_{\mathbf{k} \pm \mathbf{q}j'}$. This is also interpolated linearly but again using the dense grid. Consequently, all the effects from the energy bands and the Fermi surface are treated exactly in such scheme which allows us to avoid this source of errors in the integration.

Another source of errors is connected with the linear interpolation of the matrix elements. We have already mentioned that the matrix elements are normally smooth functions of wave vectors and one can expect that after eliminating the errors connected with the approximate treatment of the Fermi surface, the number of $\mathbf{k}$ -points need not be too large. However, in practical calculations a large cancellation occurs between the two kinds of the integrals, (42) and (43). If one uses different integration weights, it will lead to large numerical errors connected with the different convergency with respect to N_k in these integrals. Our task is thus to extract a large contribution from the integral of the type $I_2(\mathbf{q})$ and reduce it to the form $I_1(\mathbf{q})$. This is achieved by rewriting the energy denominator $\Delta = \epsilon_{\mathbf{k}j} - \epsilon_{\mathbf{k} \pm \mathbf{q}j'}$ in the expression (43) as follows:

$$\frac{1}{\Delta} = \frac{\Delta}{\Delta^2 + \delta^2} + \frac{1}{\Delta} \left(1 - \frac{\Delta^2}{\Delta^2 + \delta^2} \right), \quad (44)$$

where the broadening δ is usually chosen $\sim 0.1Ry$. Then, the sum over unoccupied bands j' in the integral containing $\Delta/(\Delta^2 + \delta^2)$ is readily performed because this expression remains regular when $\Delta \rightarrow 0$. Consequently, this integral is reduced to the integral of the type $I_1(\mathbf{q})$. The second integral in (44) contains $1/\Delta$ and must be treated as the integral of the type $I_2(\mathbf{q})$ where the original matrix element $M^{\mathbf{k} \pm \mathbf{q}j' \mathbf{k}j}$ is now multiplied by the expression in brackets in (44). However, because the latter rapidly goes to zero for $\Delta \gg \delta$, the whole integral remains small and it is non zero only for the band transitions $j \rightarrow j'$ between the states near the Fermi level. In practical calculations of the dynamical matrix, this pro-

cedure allows us to avoid the errors connecting with the large cancellations.

We finally mention that a simple correction formula which significantly improves the convergency of the integrals $I_1(\mathbf{q})$ by taking into account the curvature of the matrix elements beyond the linear interpolation was derived by Blöchl^{31,35}. Unfortunately, it is hard to derive such a correction for the integrals $I_2(\mathbf{q})$ because of the appearance of the energy denominator but we always use the Blöchl correction for the integrals (42).

d. Self-consistency at long wavelengths.

The change in the charge density (5) induced by the displacements of nuclei screens the external perturbation (4), and the linear-response equations (6)–(8) must, therefore, be solved self-consistently. Let us assume that we have found the response of the electrons, $\delta\rho^{(0)}$, to the external perturbation δV_{ext} or the perturbation screened by some guessed $\delta\rho^{guess}$ (here we omit "±" for simplicity). The latter could, for instance, be the rigid shifts of the charge density around the displaced nuclei and in practical calculations the external perturbation is always considered as the change in the bare Coulomb potential (4) plus the term $\nabla\rho$ within the MT sphere. The response $\delta\rho^{(0)}$ is found along the lines described above and, consequently, it can be considered as some polarization operator $\hat{\Pi}$ that acts on δV_{ext} , i.e.

$$\delta\rho^{(0)} = \hat{\Pi}\delta V_{ext}. \quad (45)$$

If we omit the terms containing the change in the basis functions and forget about the completeness problem of the unperturbed states, the operator $\hat{\Pi}$ is given by the independent-particle polarizability function $\hat{\pi}$:

$$\pi_{\mathbf{q}}(\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{r}') = \sum_{\mathbf{k}jj'} \frac{f_{\mathbf{k}j} - f_{\mathbf{k}+\mathbf{q}j'}}{\epsilon_{\mathbf{k}j} - \epsilon_{\mathbf{k}+\mathbf{q}j'}} \times \psi_{\mathbf{k}+\mathbf{q}j'}(\mathbf{r})\psi_{\mathbf{k}j}^*(\mathbf{r})\psi_{\mathbf{k}+\mathbf{q}j'}^*(\mathbf{r}')\psi_{\mathbf{k}j}(\mathbf{r}'). \quad (46)$$

The operator π is an integral operator while $\hat{\Pi}$ is not necessarily one. It denotes the procedure how to construct the change $\delta\rho$ from δV_{ext} . In particular, $\hat{\Pi}$ contains those part of the operator π in which the sum over conduction states runs only over the number which is equal to the number of the basis functions, N_{basis} . It also contains the contribution from the change in the basis functions according to (28), (36).

After the initial response $\delta\rho^{(0)}$ has been found, we have to calculate the screened perturbation (7). Let us call the Coulomb interaction, $e^2/|\mathbf{r}-\mathbf{r}'|$, for v_C and the exchange-correlation interaction in the LDA, $dV_{xc}/d\rho \times \delta(\mathbf{r}-\mathbf{r}')$, for v_{xc} . Then, the change δV_{eff} can be written as follows:

$$\delta V_{eff} = \delta V_{ext} + (v_C + v_{xc})\delta\rho, \quad (47)$$

and the new electronic response $\delta\rho = \hat{\Pi}\delta V_{eff}$. We thus see that the self-consistency of the induced charge density means solving the Dyson equation:

$$\delta\rho = \delta\rho^{(0)} + \hat{\Pi}(v_C + v_{xc})\delta\rho. \quad (48)$$

When $q \rightarrow 0$, the integral $v_C\delta\rho$ diverges as $1/q^2$ which immediately means that searching for the solution of Eq. (48) by iterations, i.e. $\delta\rho = \delta\rho^{(0)} + \hat{\Pi}(v_C + v_{xc})\delta\rho^{(0)} + \dots$, is impossible. However, it is possible when the input to the next, $(i+1)$ th, iteration is prepared by mixing the output and input densities from the previous, (i) th, iteration, i.e. $\delta\rho_{i+1}^{inp} = \lambda_{mix}\delta\rho_i^{out} + (1 - \lambda_{mix})\delta\rho_i^{inp}$, but the mixing parameter λ_{mix} must be chosen to be proportional to q^2 . This makes the standard mixing schemes in the long-wavelength limit extremely time-consuming.

This divergency problem is well known, and in the dielectric-matrix approach it is avoided by writing the solution (48) in the form:

$$\delta\rho = \epsilon^{-1}\delta\rho^{(0)}, \quad (49)$$

where $\epsilon^{-1} = (1 - \Pi v_C - \Pi v_{xc})^{-1}$ is an inverse dielectric matrix of the crystal. [The relation (49) is usually written for the potentials δV_{eff} and δV_{ext} but in the present context it is more convenient to remain within the density language.] If for a metal Πv_C is proportional to $N(\epsilon_F)/q^2$, where $N(\epsilon_F)$ is the density of states at the Fermi energy ϵ_F , then ϵ^{-1} behaves as q^2 when $q \rightarrow 0$: this is the well-known long-wavelength behavior of the metallic dielectric function. What we actually do when solving (48) by iterations is trying to sum up $1 - x + x^2 - \dots = 1/(1+x)$ for $x > 1$.

In order to avoid this problem we use Thomas-Fermi-like screening theory. To explain the idea we assume that the change in charge density and the potential are expanded in plane waves,

$$\delta\rho(\mathbf{r}) = \sum_{\mathbf{G}} \delta\rho(\mathbf{G}) e^{i(\mathbf{q}+\mathbf{G})\mathbf{r}}. \quad (50)$$

We divide the Coulomb interaction v_C into a long-range and a short-range parts, i.e. $v_C = v_C^{long} + v_C^{short}$, where $v_C^{long} = 4\pi e^2/q^2 \times \exp[i\mathbf{q}(\mathbf{r} - \mathbf{r}')]]$. The exchange-correlation in LDA is always short ranged and can be treated together with v_C^{short} , i.e. $v_C^{short} + v_{xc} = w^{short}$. The Dyson equation can then be written as follows:

$$\delta\rho(\mathbf{r}) = \delta\rho^{(0)}(\mathbf{r}) + \frac{4\pi e^2}{q^2} \delta\rho(0) \Pi_{\mathbf{q}}(\mathbf{r}) + \{\hat{\Pi} w^{short} \delta\rho\}(\mathbf{r}), \quad (51)$$

where we have separated out the divergent contribution, $\delta\rho(0) \equiv \delta\rho(\mathbf{G} = 0)$, and where we have called the response of electrons to the perturbation given by a single plane wave $\exp(i\mathbf{q}\mathbf{r})$ for $\Pi_{\mathbf{q}}(\mathbf{r})$. It can be written as an integral over the unit cell Ω_c :

$$\Pi_{\mathbf{q}}(\mathbf{r}) = \int_{\Omega_c} \pi_{\mathbf{q}}(\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{r}') e^{i\mathbf{q}\mathbf{r}'} d\mathbf{r}'. \quad (52)$$

The $\mathbf{G} = 0$ part of Eq. (51) can be written as follows:

$$\delta\rho(0) = \epsilon_{long}^{-1} \left(\delta\rho^{(0)}(0) + \{\hat{\Pi} w^{short} \delta\rho\}(\mathbf{G} = 0) \right), \quad (53)$$

where we have introduced an effective dielectric constant:

$$\epsilon_{long} = 1 - \frac{4\pi e^2}{q^2} \Pi_{\mathbf{q}}(\mathbf{G} = 0). \quad (54)$$

Inserting Eq. (53) in to the Dyson equation (51) we obtain:

$$\begin{aligned} \delta\rho(\mathbf{r}) &= \delta\rho^{(0)}(\mathbf{r}) + \frac{4\pi e^2}{q^2 + \kappa_D^2} \\ &\times \left(\delta\rho^{(0)}(0) + \{\hat{\Pi} w^{short} \delta\rho\}(\mathbf{G} = 0) \right) \\ &\times \Pi_{\mathbf{q}}(\mathbf{r}) + \{\hat{\Pi} w^{short} \delta\rho\}(\mathbf{r}), \end{aligned} \quad (55)$$

where $\kappa_D^2 = -4\pi e^2 \Pi_{\mathbf{q}}(\mathbf{G} = 0)$ is the Debye screening radius. The screened Dyson equation (55) is free of the difficulties discussed above and can be solved iteratively. First, one has to find the function $\Pi_{\mathbf{q}}(\mathbf{r})$ as the response of electrons to a single plane wave $\exp(i\mathbf{q}\mathbf{r})$, and from that obtain κ_D^2 . Then the initial distribution $\delta\rho^{(0)}(\mathbf{r})$ is calculated. During the iterations one first finds the response to the short-range part of the perturbation, i.e. $\{\hat{\Pi} w^{short} \delta\rho\}(\mathbf{r})$, and, secondly, the long-wavelength contribution is added as given by the second term in the right-hand side of Eq. (55). The output change in the charge density is usually mixed with the input $\delta\rho$ to obtain an input for the new iteration. This makes the self-consistent cycle stable, but the mixing parameter λ_{mix} in this case does not have to go to zero for $\mathbf{q} \rightarrow 0$ and it is usually chosen to be 0.2 – 0.5. In practical applications we have found that the number of iterations required to solve (55) is about 10 while for solving the original Dyson equation (48) the number of iterations varies from 50 to 200 depending on the length $|\mathbf{q}|$ of the wave vector. The latter is, of course, not true for those phonon modes where $\delta\rho(0) \equiv 0$ by symmetry.

One can obviously consider the screening of not only the component $\delta V(\mathbf{G}) \sim \delta\rho(\mathbf{G})/|\mathbf{q} + \mathbf{G}|^2$ with $\mathbf{G} = 0$ but all the components within a certain sphere $|\mathbf{q} + \mathbf{G}| \leq G_{cutoff}$. This, for instance, is necessary for those zone-boundary wave vectors where $|\mathbf{q}| = |\mathbf{q} + \mathbf{G}|$. In this case the function $\Pi_{\mathbf{q}}(\mathbf{r})$ is replaced by the functions $\Pi_{\mathbf{q}+\mathbf{G}}(\mathbf{r})$, i.e. at the beginning it is necessary to calculate the response of the electrons to the perturbation $\exp[i(\mathbf{q}+\mathbf{G})\mathbf{r}]$. The corresponding Dyson equation should be written again to account for the fact that ϵ_{long} is now the matrix $\epsilon_{long}(\mathbf{q} + \mathbf{G}, \mathbf{q} + \mathbf{G}')$. This will reduce the number of iterations even more.

Finally, we would like to point out that it should be possible to apply the same idea to the self-consistency problem in the standard band structure calculation. In the crystal, due to electroneutrality of the charge density, $\rho(\mathbf{G} = 0) = 0$. However, for those reciprocal-lattice vectors which are small, the components of the potential $V(\mathbf{G}) \sim \rho(\mathbf{G})/|\mathbf{G}|^2$ might be large. This is especially

the case for large many-atomic unit cells. As a consequence, the mixing parameter λ_{mix} has to be chosen very small. The procedure described above will require the calculation of the polarizability (46) with $\mathbf{q} = 0$ at each self-consistent iteration, i.e. the response of electrons to the plane waves $\exp[i\mathbf{G}\mathbf{r}]$ according to the expression (52) for all small vectors $|\mathbf{G}| \leq G_{cutoff}$. The cutoff can be chosen as the radius of the smallest first coordination sphere in G -space. The computational time for finding the $\Pi_G(\mathbf{r})$ -functions should presumably not exceed the time of one self-consistent iteration while the total number of iterations needed to reach the convergence is expected to decrease by approximately one order of magnitude, which is the case in linear-response calculation. Note that the idea just outlined is different from the idea of finding the self-consistent charge transfer in terms of the linear-response theory³⁷. For large cells we are screening the small G -components of the potential which result from some average density distribution. On the other hand, such details as the charge transfer between nearest atoms is described by large G -components of $\rho(\mathbf{G})$.

IV. APPLICATIONS.

In recent publications^{10,12,13} we have demonstrated the ability of our linear-response method to compute whole phonon dispersions and electron-phonon interactions in such complicated systems as transition metals *Nb* and *Mo*. In the present paper we will describe application of the method for calculating phonon dispersions in the materials with a few atoms per unit cell and with a relatively open crystalline structures. Two systems have been chosen for the applications. The first one is *Si* which is an excellent test case because of its open diamond structure. The second one is a transition-metal carbide *NbC*. This is a well-known classic superconductor with $T_c = 11.5K$ and its phonon dispersions show many anomalies that are not present in other simple-metallic and insulating systems. Studying these anomalies as well as their influence on superconductivity and transport is interesting in itself and also represents a hard test for our method. Here we will only describe the calculations for the phonon dispersion curves in *NbC* and compare the results with experiments. The calculated electron-phonon interaction and transport properties will be published elsewhere.

a. Si.

Si is a well studied elemental semiconductor from both experimental and theoretical sides and its phonon dispersions have been measured long time ago³⁸. Recent linear-response^{5,8} and supercell¹⁶ calculations have allowed to determine its lattice dynamics for the wave vectors in the entire Brillouin zone and the results show

a good agreement with the experiment. These calculations were based on the linear-augmented-plane-wave and plane-wave pseudopotential methods. Within the localized-orbital representation employed in the LMTO method it is generally difficult to treat the materials with the diamond structure and, to reach close packing, interstitial spheres are usually placed into the empty sites of the lattice. This complicates the determination of the dynamical matrix. However, this problem is avoided in our method by the use of the Fourier transform for the LMTOs in the interstitial region.

We calculate the dynamical matrix of *Si* as a function of wave vector for a set of irreducible $\mathbf{q}$ -points in a (6,6,6)-reciprocal lattice grid (16 points per 1/48th part of the BZ). The (*I, J, K*) reciprocal lattice (or Monkhorst-Pack) grid is defined in a usual manner: $\mathbf{q}_{ijk} = \frac{i}{I}\mathbf{G}_1 + \frac{j}{J}\mathbf{G}_2 + \frac{k}{K}\mathbf{G}_3$, where $\mathbf{G}_1, \mathbf{G}_2, \mathbf{G}_3$ are the primitive translations in reciprocal space. The details of the calculations for every $\mathbf{q}$ -point are the following: We use $3\kappa - spd$ LMTO basis set (27 orbitals per atom) with the one-center expansions inside the MT-spheres performed up to $l_{max} = 6$. In the interstitial region, the *s*, *p* and *d* - basis functions are expanded in plane waves up to 15.1, 22.3, 31.7 Ry (282, 530, 868 plane waves) respectively. The induced charge densities and screened potentials are represented inside the MT-spheres by spherical harmonics up to $l_{max} = 6$ and by plane waves with the 110.2 Ry energy cutoff (5208 plane waves) in the interstitial region. The $\mathbf{k}$ -integration over the BZ is performed over the (6,6,6) - grid (the same grid as for the phonon wave vectors $\mathbf{q}$) by means of the improved tetrahedron method³⁵ which is identical in the case of *Si* to the special-point method of Monkhorst and Pack. The MT-sphere radius was taken to be 2.214 a.u. and the Barth-Hedin-like exchange-correlation formulae after Ref. 39 are employed. We use theoretically determined lattice parameter in the calculation (the volume ratio $V/V_{exp} = 0.991$).

Fig.1 shows a comparison between calculated and experimental phonon dispersion curves along the major high-symmetry directions. The calculated phonon density of states is plotted at the right part in the figure. The theoretical frequencies are denoted by circles and the experimental ones are denoted by triangles. The lines result from the interpolation between the theoretical points. The calculated and experimental phonon frequencies at the high-symmetry points Γ , *X*, and *L* are also listed in Table 1. We see that the agreement between theory and experiment is very good. Especially, in the optical region the discrepancy is about 1-1.5%, which is surprising because the accuracy of the measured phonon modes is of the same order of magnitude. We also reproduce the extended flat regions of the transverse acoustic modes indicating the accurate description of long-range interactions between *Si*-atoms as well as the correct long-wavelength behavior showing the good accuracy of calculated elastic properties of this crystal. Larger discrepancy is found for

the frequencies of the TA modes, where the theoretical branches are approximately 10% softer than the experimental ones. For instance, the calculated frequency of the X_{TA} - mode is 4.00 THz while $\omega_{exp}(X_{TA}) = 4.49 \pm 0.06$ THz³⁸. The same kind of discrepancy has also been recently reported in Refs. 8,16. The agreement is slightly improved when we recalculate the dynamical matrix at the X - point using the experimental lattice constant. We have found that the frequency of the X_{TA} - mode is increased from 4.00 to 4.27 THz. This shows that the mode has a large negative Gruneisen parameter and it is thus very sensitive to the unit-cell volume used in the calculation. Because of the large LMTO basis sets, large l_{max} and plane-wave energy cutoffs this discrepancy is hard to relate to the internal parameters in the calculation and it is most likely connected with the local density approximation.

b. NbC.

The lattice dynamical properties of transition-metal carbides and, especially, *NbC* have attracted much attention in the past because of the existence of pronounced anomalies in its acoustic branches and their influence to superconductivity. While some model calculations of the phonon dispersions exist in the literature and various mechanisms explaining these anomalies have been proposed⁴⁰, no *ab initio* investigation of the lattice dynamics for *NbC* have so far been performed. Here we apply the linear-response approach to the phonon spectrum of *NbC* in order to check the accuracy of our method.

The dynamical matrix of *NbC* is calculated at the 29 irreducible $\mathbf{q}$ - points of a (8, 8, 8) reciprocal-lattice grid. The self-consistent calculations performed for every wave vector involve the following parameters: 3κ - *spd* LMTO basis per *Nb* atom (27 orbitals) and 3κ - *sp* LMTO basis per carbon atom (12 orbitals). The one-center expansions inside the MT-spheres are performed up to $l_{max} = 6$. In the interstitial region the basis functions are expanded in plane waves up to 13.4, 19.6, 26.9 Ry (136, 228, 338 plane waves) for, respectively, *s*, *p* and *d* - orbitals of *Nb*, and up to 24.1, 35.8 Ry (306, 536 plane waves) for *s*, *p* -orbitals of *C*. The changes in the charge densities and the potentials are represented inside the MT-spheres by spherical harmonics up to $l_{max} = 6$ and by plane waves with an 121 Ry energy cutoff (3382 plane waves) in the interstitial region. The $\mathbf{k}$ -space integration for the matrix elements is performed over a (8, 8, 8) - grid (the same grid as for the phonon wave vectors $\mathbf{q}$) by means of the improved tetrahedron method³⁵. However, the integration weights for the $\mathbf{k}$ -points of this grid have been found to take into account the effects arising from the Fermi surface and the energy bands precisely. This is done with help of a (32, 32, 32) grid (897 $\mathbf{k}$ - points per 1/48 BZ) as we explained in Section III(c) of this paper. The MT-sphere radius of *Nb* is taken to be 2.411 a.u. and the radius of the carbon sphere is 1.786 a.u.

The Barth-Hedin-like exchange-correlation formulae after Ref. 39 are employed. As in the case of *Si*, we also use the theoretically determined lattice parameter in this calculation (the volume ratio $V/V_{exp} = 0.982$).

The results of our calculations are presented in Fig. 2, where we compare theoretically determined phonon dispersions (circles) with those measured by inelastic-neutron-scattering technique⁴¹ (triangles). The calculated phonon density of states is plotted at the right part of the figure. The lines are simply the result of interpolation between the theoretical points. Since the $\mathbf{q}$ -grid (8, 8, 8) considered here is still too coarse to resolve the anomaly of the longitudinal acoustic branch near the wave vector $(0.6, 0, 0) 2\pi/a$, we have performed a separate calculation for the $\mathbf{q}$ -point $(0.625, 0, 0)$ which fits to the (16, 16, 16) - grid in $\mathbf{k}$ -space. We see that the agreement between theory and experiment is good. Most of the calculated frequencies agree within a few percent with those measured despite of the fact that we have used only 29 $\mathbf{k}$ -points for the BZ-integration. (We list for comparison our calculated and experimental phonon frequencies at the high-symmetry points Γ , X , and L in Table 2.) The theory reproduces the major anomalies presented in the acoustic branches: the well-known anomaly near the wave vector $(0.6, 0, 0) 2\pi/a$ which is also present and well described¹⁰ within our linear-response method in pure *Nb* crystal; the anomaly of the longitudinal mode near the wave vector $(0.5, 0.5, 0) 2\pi/a$ as well as large softening of both TA and LA modes near the L -point. Moreover, we also predict an anomalous behavior of the lowest transverse acoustic mode along the $(\xi\xi 0)$ direction near the wave vector $(0.5, 0.5, 0) 2\pi/a$. Here the frequencies are not known experimentally. The anomaly found by us is, however, less pronounced compared to the results of double-shell model calculations of Weber⁴² while we have certainly not too many points along this direction to judge about its exact dispersion.

V. CONCLUSION.

In conclusion, we have described in detail an all-electron linear-response approach based on density functional theory and the LMTO technique. The method is developed to calculate lattice dynamical properties of crystalline solids and is uniquely applicable for the systems with broad and narrow energy bands. For test purposes, we have applied the method to compute phonon dispersions for *Si* and *NbC* which have open structures and two atoms per unit cell. The results of our applications are in a good agreement with the experiment. We have thus shown that accurate calculations of lattice dynamics are now possible even for such complicated systems as transition-metal compounds. In the forthcoming paper⁴³ we give a description of our method for calculating electron-phonon interactions and apply the method to compute lattice-dynamical, superconducting and transport properties for a large number of ele-

mental metals (a brief report of this work has appeared already¹²). In another publication⁴⁴ we describe an application of the method for computing electron-phonon-coupling strength in $Ca - Sr - Cu - O$ high- T_c superconductor.

Acknowledgments: The author is indebted to Professor O. K. Andersen for many helpful discussions and to Dr. O. Jepsen for careful reading of the manuscript prior to the publication. The work was partially supported by INTAS (93-2154), ISF(MF-8300), and RFFI grants.

APPENDIX: Fourier transform of pseudoLMTOs.

Consider a Hankel function $K_{\kappa L}(\mathbf{r}) = K_{\kappa l}(r)i^l Y_{lm}(\mathbf{r})$ of energy κ^2 which is singular at the origin. The three-dimensional Fourier transform of this function $K_{\kappa L}(\mathbf{k})$ is known to behave as k^{l-2} for large k . The task is to substitute the divergent part of $K_{\kappa l}(r)$ inside some sphere s by a smooth regular but otherwise arbitrary function. This function is chosen so that the Fourier transform is convergent fast. In the full-potential LMTO method of Ref. 28, the augmenting function is the linear combination of the Bessel function $J_{\kappa L}$ and its energy derivative $\dot{J}_{\kappa L}$ matched together with its first-order radial derivative with the Hankel function at the sphere boundary. The Fourier transform becomes convergent as k^{-4} . One can obviously include higher-order energy derivatives $J_{\kappa L}^{(n)}$ in order to have a smooth matching at the sphere up to the order n . This was done in connection with the problem of solving the Poisson equation in Ref. 33. The Fourier transform here converges as $k^{-(3+n)}$ but the prefactor increases as $(2l + 2n + 3)!!$ and this prohibits the use of large values of n . A similar procedure has been also used in the LMTO method of Ref. 29. In the present work we will use a different approach based on the Ewald method. Instead of substituting the divergent part only for $r < s$ we consider the solution of the equation:

$$(-\nabla^2 - \kappa^2)\tilde{K}_{\kappa L}(\mathbf{r}) = a_l \left(\frac{r}{s}\right)^l e^{-r^2\eta^2 + \kappa^2/\eta^2} i^l Y_{lm}(\mathbf{r}), \quad (56)$$

The function on the right-hand side of the Helmholtz equation is a decaying Gaussian. The parameter a_l is a normalization constant: $a_l = \sqrt{2/\pi}(2\eta^2)^{l+3/2}s^{2l+1}/(2l-1)!!$. The most important parameter is η . It is chosen such that the Gaussian is approximately zero when $r > s$ and η must depend on l as well as the sphere radius s . The solution $\tilde{K}_{\kappa L}(\mathbf{r})$ is thus the Hankel function for large r , it is a regular function for small r and it is smooth together with its radial derivatives at any r . The function $\tilde{K}_{\kappa l}(r)$ can be calculated in terms of the following error-function-like contour integral:

$$\tilde{K}_{\kappa l}(r) = \frac{(2s)^{l+1}}{\sqrt{\pi}(2l-1)!!} r^l \int_{0+}^{\eta} \xi^{2l} e^{-r^2\xi^2 + \kappa^2/4\xi^2} d\xi. \quad (57)$$

When $\eta \rightarrow \infty$ this integral is known as the Hankel integral. The most important result is that the Fourier transform of $\tilde{K}_{\kappa l}(r)$ decays exponentially. It is given by:

$$\tilde{K}_{\kappa l}(r) = \frac{2}{\pi} \frac{s^{l+1}}{(2l-1)!!} \int_0^\infty k^2 dk j_l(kr) \frac{k^l e^{(\kappa^2 - k^2)/4\eta^2}}{k^2 - \kappa^2}. \quad (58)$$

Restoring the original notations, the pseudoLMTOs $\tilde{\chi}_{\kappa RL}^{\mathbf{k}}(\mathbf{r})$ are the Bloch waves of wave vector $\mathbf{k}$ as defined in Eq. (27). The Fourier coefficients $\tilde{\chi}_{\kappa RL}(\mathbf{k} + \mathbf{G})$ are given by:

$$\tilde{\chi}_{\kappa RL}(\mathbf{k} + \mathbf{G}) = \frac{4\pi}{\Omega_c} \frac{s_R^{l+1}}{(2l-1)!!} \frac{|\mathbf{k} + \mathbf{G}|^l}{|\mathbf{k} + \mathbf{G}|^2 - \kappa^2} \times e^{(\kappa^2 - |\mathbf{k} + \mathbf{G}|^2)/4\eta_{RL}^2} Y_L(\mathbf{k} + \mathbf{G}) e^{-i(\mathbf{k} + \mathbf{G})\mathbf{R}}, \quad (59)$$

where Ω_c is the volume of the unit cell and where we have subscripted η with the indexes RL and s with R .

In practical calculations the parameter η_{RL} can be chosen from the ratio between the Hankel function at the sphere and the solution of Eq. (56), i.e. $\tilde{K}_{\kappa l}(s_R)/K_{\kappa l}(s_R) = 1 + \delta$. The error $|\delta|$ is usually taken not larger than 0.03 which leads to the number of plane waves per atom needed for the convergency in (27) varying from 150 to 250 when $l = 2$. For the s, p -orbitals this number is smaller by a factor of 2–3.

[†] On leave from P. N. Lebedev Physical Institute of the Russian Academy of Sciences, Leninski pr. 53, 117924 Moscow, Russia

¹ P. Hohenberg and W. Kohn, Phys. Rev. **136**, B864 (1964).

² W. Kohn and L. J. Sham, Phys. Rev. **140**, A1133 (1965).

³ For a review, see, also, *Theory of the Inhomogeneous Electron Gas*, edited by S. Lundqvist and S. H. March (Plenum, New York, 1983).

⁴ M. S. Hybersten and S. G. Louie, Phys. Rev. B **35**, 5585 (1987), *ibid.* 5606 (1987).

⁵ P. Giannozzi, S. Gironcoli, P. Pavone, and S. Baroni, Phys. Rev. B **43**, 7231 (1991).

⁶ D. Kh. Blat, N. E. Zein, and V. I. Zinenko, J. Phys. Condens. Matter **3**, 5515 (1991).

⁷ X. Gonze, D. C. Allan, and M. P. Teter, Phys. Rev. Lett. **68**, 3603 (1992).

⁸ R. Yu and H. Krakauer, Phys. Rev. B **49**, 4467 (1994).

⁹ S. Y. Savrasov, Solid State Commun. **74**, 69 (1990).

¹⁰ S. Y. Savrasov, Phys. Rev. Lett. **69**, 2819 (1992)

¹¹ N. E. Zein, Phys. Lett. A **161**, 526 (1992).

- ¹² S. Y. Savrasov, D. Y. Savrasov, and O. K. Andersen, Phys. Rev. Lett. **72**, 372 (1994).
- ¹³ S. Y. Savrasov and E. G. Maksimov, Usp. Fiz. Nauk **165**, 773 (1995).
- ¹⁴ S. Gironcoli, Phys. Rev. B **51**, 6773 (1995).
- ¹⁵ H. Wendel and R. M. Martin, Phys. Rev. B **19**, 5251 (1979), K. Kunc and E. Tosatti, Phys. Rev. B **29**, 7045 (1984).
- ¹⁶ S. Wei and M. Y. Chou, Phys. Rev. Lett. **69**, 2799 (1992).
- ¹⁷ X. Gonze, Phys. Rev. A **52**, 1096 (1995).
- ¹⁸ An overview is given by A. R. Williams and U. von Barth, in Ref. 3, p. 189.
- ¹⁹ See, e.g., *Ab Initio Calculations of Phonon Spectra*, edited by J. T. Devreese, V. E. Doren, and P. E. Van Camp (Plenum, New York 1983).
- ²⁰ S. Baroni, P. Giannozzi, and A. Testa, Phys. Rev. Lett. **58**, 1861 (1987).
- ²¹ N. E. Zein, Fiz. Tverd. Tela (Leningrad) **26**, 3024 (1984).
- ²² R. M. Sternheimer, Phys. Rev. **96**, 951 (1954); *ibid* **107**, 1565 (1957); *ibid* **115**, 1198 (1959).
- ²³ O. K. Andersen, Phys. Rev. B **12**, 3060 (1975).
- ²⁴ P. Pulay, Mol. Phys. **17**, 197 (1969).
- ²⁵ S. Y. Savrasov and D. Y. Savrasov, Phys. Rev. B **46**, 12181 (1992).
- ²⁶ M. Springborg and O. K. Andersen, J. Chem. Phys. **87**, 7125 (1987).
- ²⁷ O. K. Andersen, O. Jepsen, and G. Krier, in *Lectures on Methods of Electronic Structure Calculations*, edited by V. Kumar, O. K. Andersen, and A. Mookerjee (World Scientific, Singapore 1994)
- ²⁸ K. H. Weyrich, Phys. Rev. B **37**, 10269 (1988);
- ²⁹ J. Wills, unpublished.
- ³⁰ M. Methfessel, Phys. Rev. B **38**, 1537 (1988).
- ³¹ P. Blochl, Ph.D. thesis, Max-Planck Institut für Festkörperforschung, 1989.
- ³² D. A. Varshalovich, A. N. Moskalev, and V. K. Khersonskii, *Quantum Theory of Angular Momentum* (World Scientific, Singapore 1988)
- ³³ M. Weinert, J. Math. Phys. **22**, 2433 (1981).
- ³⁴ O. Jepsen and O. K. Andersen, Phys. Rev. B **29**, 5965 (1984)
- ³⁵ P. Blochl, O. Jepsen, and O. K. Andersen, Phys. Rev. B **49**, 16223 (1994).
- ³⁶ H. J. Monkhorst and J. D. Pack, Phys. Rev. B **13**, 5188 (1976).
- ³⁷ H. L. Skriver and N. M. Rosengaard, Phys. Rev. B **46**, 7156 (1992).
- ³⁸ G. Dolling, in *Inelastic Scattering of Neutrons in Solids and Liquids* IAEA, Vienna 1963, Vol. II, p. 37; G. Nillsson and G. Nelin, Phys. Rev. B **8**, 5711 (1973).
- ³⁹ U. von Barth and L. Hedin, J. Phys. C **5**, 1629 (1972); V. L. Moruzzi, J. F. Janak, and A. R. Williams, *Calculated Electronic Properties of Metals* (Pergamon, New York, 1978)
- ⁴⁰ For a review, see, e.g., S. K. Sinha in *Dynamical properties of solids*, edited by A. A. Maradudin and G. K. Horton (North Holland, Amsterdam, 1980), Vol. 3, p.1.
- ⁴¹ H. G. Smith and W. Gläser, in *Proceedings of the International Conference on Phonons*, edited by M. A. Nusimovici (Flammarion, Paris, 1971).
- ⁴² W. Weber, Phys. Rev. B **8**, 5082 (1973).
- ⁴³ S. Y. Savrasov, D. Y. Savrasov, and O. K. Andersen (unpublished).
- ⁴⁴ S. Y. Savrasov, in *Bulletin of the March Meeting of the American Physical Society*, St. Louis, USA, 1996; S. Y. Savrasov and O. K. Andersen (unpublished).

TABLE I. Comparison between calculated and experimental phonon frequencies at the high-symmetry points Γ , X , and L for Si [THz].

	Γ_{LTO}	X_{TA}	X_{LAO}	X_{TO}	L_{TA}	L_{LA}	L_{TO}	L_{LO}
theory	15.56	4.00	12.27	13.90	3.09	11.20	14.78	12.38
exp ^a .	15.53	4.49	12.32	13.90	3.43	11.35	14.68	12.60

^aReference 38

TABLE II. Comparison between calculated and experimental phonon frequencies at the high-symmetry points Γ , X , and L for NbC [THz].

	Γ_{LTO}	X_{TA}	X_{LA}	X_{TO}	X_{LO}	L_{TA}	L_{LA}	L_{TO}	L_{LO}
theory	17.05	6.37	7.51	17.64	18.65	4.26	6.02	18.82	21.60
exp ^a .	16.70	6.35	7.30	17.20	17.80	4.00	6.00	—	19.20

^aReference 41

Fig. 1. Calculated phonon dispersion for Si (circles) along the high-symmetry directions in comparison with the experiment³⁸ (triangles). The lines are the result of interpolation between theoretical points. Also shown is the calculated phonon density of states (DOS).

Fig. 2. Calculated phonon dispersion for NbC (circles) along the high-symmetry directions in comparison with the experiment⁴¹ (triangles). The lines are the result of interpolation between theoretical points. Also shown is the calculated phonon density of states (DOS).



